

OUR DESTINY

The Influence of Socialism on Morals and Religion

AN ESSAY IN ETHICS

BY

LAURENCE GRONLUND, M.A.

AUTHOR OF "THE CO-OPERATIVE COMMONWEALTH," AND "GA IRA."

"Hitch thy wagon to a star."—EMERSON.

2

SECOND



EDITION



170/4
940

LONDON

SWAN SONNENSCHN & CO.
PATERNOSTER SQUARE

1891.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

1. My Object - - - - -	PAGE
CHAPTER I.—THE SOIL.	
2. Roots of Morals.—3. The Impending Change.—4. System.—5. Abundance.—6. Freedom.—7. Leisure.—8. Insufficiency of all these - - - - -	1
CHAPTER II.—THE SOCIAL BOND.	
9. Order.—10. Authority.—11. Patriotism.—12. Collective Conscience.—13. Love of Approbation.—14. Equality.—15. Individuality - - - - -	25
CHAPTER III.—CONTRADICTIONS.	
16. The Intellectual Atmosphere.—17. Liberty.—18. Democracy.—19. Social Functions.—20. Struggle for Life.—21. Social Self.—22. End of <i>Data</i> of Ethics - - - - -	49
CHAPTER IV.—DUTY OR JUSTICE.	
23. Pessimism.—24. Conventional Morality.—25. Temptations.—26. Diligence.—27. Obedience.—28. Integrity.—29. The Ideal - - - - -	70
CHAPTER V.—LOVE.	
30. Purity.—31. Conjugal Love.—32. Parent and Child.—33. Servants.—34. Sympathy.—35. Sacrifice.—36. A Typical Life - - - - -	96
CHAPTER VI.—GOD IN HUMANITY.	
37. Blossom of Morals.—38. Purpose—God's Presence.—39. Morality now "Law."—40. Kingdom of Heaven.—41. What will be, is His will.—32. Soul of Humanity.—43. The True Mediator - - - - -	126
CHAPTER VII.—THE HEREAFTER.	
44. Fruit of Morals.—45. Psychic Investigations.—46. Memory.—47. Self-ness.—48. Self-hood.—49. Our Common Destiny.—50. Your Life-Work - - - - -	146

OUR DESTINY.

MY OBJECT.

"The nineteenth century so far has been nothing but a riddle."
Jules Simon.

1. Leslie Stephen claims that ethical problems require to be discussed in every generation with a change of dialect. This is emphatically the case now, but the dialect must be very different from that adopted in his *Science of Ethics*. Events are at hand that can be, most fitly, compared with the advent of Christianity.

Three writers have discussed the future that awaits us. Mallock, in *Is Life Worth Living*, warns us that it will be disastrous if we do not return to the old beliefs; Morison, in *The Service of Man*, prophesies it will be glorious if we will only give up all religious notions, while Professor Graham, in *The Creed of Science*, consoles us that our moral and religious acquisitions will not be seriously threatened. I have arrived at very different and much more ennobling conclusions (for which the reader, if he be but patient, will in the course of this essay find, at all events, a sufficient number of reasons), to wit:

That Nationalism (by which I simply mean American Socialism) will be the future economic system in all civilised countries, and that it will be inaugurated, not by violence, but by enthusiasm.

That it will establish virtually the Kingdom of Heaven on earth, mainly by rendering all humanity precious to each of us — what now to all sensible people must seem an impossible feat.

That it will evolve an irresistible belief in God and Immortality which will satisfy all the instincts of the human heart as well as the most developed intelligences.

That is to say : I hold that, though it is perhaps a fact that a majority of those who are called Socialists are avowed Atheists, yet Atheism is not an integral part of Socialism, but merely an accretion upon it, like tartar upon the enamel of the teeth. Such are Atheists, not because they are Socialists, but because they are Frenchmen and Germans. Socialism is eminently religious.

Very little has hitherto been done to persuade the higher order of minds or to place Socialism in its proper light before them. To speak frankly, I can perfectly sympathise with Sir James Stephen, who, in the future, generally foreshadowed by the motto of *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity*, cannot see "a state of society which a reasonable man ought to regard with enthusiasm and self-devotion."¹ I can very well understand that a society confined even to the most fascinating and abundant material enjoyments, but in which morality is simply an invention to abate social jars and frictions, is not seductive to such minds.

William H. Mallock illustrates his fears by saying : "The path of thought has taken a sudden turn around a mountain, and we find ourselves looking bewildered on an utterly unfamiliar prospect. * * * A mist hangs over it, and we have no right to be sure it is the promised land or not." He is very much afraid that it means our spiritual degradation and the destruction of our whole moral civilisation.

Now, I have ventured on this essay because I firmly believe that I can dissipate the mist, and prove to unbiassed minds and sympathetic hearts that it is, indeed, towards "the Promised Land" that the Power behind Evolution has all the time been leading our race. If this "moral civilisation" must pass away, it is only because it will grow into something much grander. At present it is an "immoral" growth : Pharisaism, precisely of a kin to that, so fiercely denounced by Jesus, which makes self-styled "better citizens," who, having never known what temptation means, strut about praising God that they are so much better than their

¹ It will become apparent in the course of this essay, that I take a profound interest in this virile book, though it was intended to be a refutation of Socialism.

humble, temptation-ridden brethren who are tempted every moment of their poor life to act wrongly by this *satanic* system or ours. And the morality which will take its place, I am sure, can be best stated in that sublime precept which embodies the deepest truth : that in which we are bidden to love our neighbours as ourselves. Instead of spiritual degradation, American Socialism, as I understand it, will give us a profound conviction of the presence of God in Humanity, and confer on Humanity a special dignity, fit to inherit "endless times and eternities." And if the American people can be persuaded that Socialism really offers them such an ideal, the next half century will be a period of change compared with which the past fifty years will seem tame and uneventful.

Such an effort seems now particularly opportune. It is well known that a constructive form of Socialism has for some years been evolving among American working-men. The conscience of the country has during the past twelve months been aroused, as it has not been since the anti-slavery agitation—witness the Nationalist and Christian Socialist movements—an evidence that our comfortable classes are becoming conscience of being part of a living organism that suffers. The soil then is fertile and prepared, the time favourable. Throughout our country there is a moral awakening and a deepening ferment. All the signs and portents seemingly declare : God wills it !

What a proud distinction for our American civilisation would it be—compared with that of Europe—if some of the leaders of intellect and conscience among us would, like modern Richards, place themselves at the head of the new social crusade. Nothing, surely, would so fill and fire such men with the needed enthusiasm and devotion as the ideal here presented.

To present this ideal is my present object, and I believe I have the qualifications for making this effort. I do not refer to literary ability. I entered upon my works of Socialist exposition, not from literary ambition, but from a deep conviction that I had something to tell my fellow-men.

The rise and spread of Pessimism is a fact of great interest and significance. "A strange protest surely, that, in these days when

the jubilant chorus is loudest, the note of desolation and despair has broken in as a discord that suddenly finds acceptance, first of all, among the fortunate classes—a philosophy, affirming the nullity of all things, and asking: Is life worth living?" Yet while Pessimism is a symptom of the hollowness at the core of the present order, I, whose lot is certainly not cast among the fortunate ones of this world, answer: Yes! Life, if lightened and warmed by a true philosophy, is worth living. My secondary purpose is to communicate this, my joy in life, to others. In spite of experiencing more than most men the hardships of the established state of things, in spite of privations and lack of sympathy for many years, I know that this is the threshold of the Golden Age, and feel that it is a high privilege to live now, a privilege which I am sure posterity will envy me. My faith makes me an optimist: of this faith I proceed to give an account, confident that it will soon be realised

LAURENCE GRONLUND.

CHAPTER I.

THE SOIL.

"Keep hammering away, even at the risk of being deemed a victim of crotchets. For this is a not over-intelligent world."—*John Fiske.*

2. Spencer's *Data of Ethics* should be rather called "Data of Selfishness," or "Data of the Animal Well-being of Man," as it does not go beyond our animal origin, and considers goodness in man identical in kind with goodness in a dog or in a rock. Mallock, on the other hand, remains in the clouds, where mankind could not dwell if it would, and his morality, rooted in these clouds, is thus a topsy-turvy growth. J. C. Morison, lastly, who has a practical eye for the needs of our immediate future, unfortunately opens his book, *The Service of Man*, with this simile: "A ruined temple, with its fallen columns and broken arches, is a suggestive type of the transitory nature of all human handiwork," and applies this to all human activities, even the highest. Such a view is dispiriting enough to make one, entering upon this service, throw it up at once and commit suicide; but what is more to the point, it is false, because one-sided; just as false as is that of a person with the jaundice, who sees all things yellow. This essay, whatever it is, will be found radically different from either of those three works.

In order to get a type that would appear to me adequate of man's highest work, of that which he has been sent into this

world to do, let me outline a stately tree, a tree whose germ was planted with the advent of life upon this planet; which has been growing ever since, and which is destined to reach a marvellous height and girth, until its rich foliage shall finally overshadow and shelter the whole world, and its one blossom and one fruit, more precious by far than all mythological apples, shall fill the earth with gladness. Such is an approximate, and yet inadequate, type of man's distinctive work, his permanent work, since by its fruit it is connected with all eternity; for by the one blossom I typify his belief in God and by the one fruit his belief in Immortality. This tree, in other words, is a type of what in Greek is called Ethics, in Latin, Morality, and in Saxon, Righteousness.

Mark, I say, *is destined to*, for morality is yet but very small, a stunted bush, and what I wish to emphasise is, that under the circumstances by which it is and has hitherto been surrounded, it could not be anything else. I repudiate all physical, materialistic morality as utterly false—the gross, initial mistake of Evolution-moralists—and I contend that the germ of morality has, sometime and somehow, come upon earth from on high or from elsewhere. But there is another point, equally important and certain, which the Intuitionists are just as wrong in ignoring: namely, that material surroundings, almost exclusively, condition the growth of this germ; or as the Evolution-moralists rightly put it: "The moral development of a given period is determined by the corresponding state of the social evolution."

First, then, it is a fact, that economics, or our material, industrial relations, are the soil in which the roots of morals bury themselves and from which they draw their nourishment; next, it is equally a fact, that the state of morals is much dependent on whether the social atmosphere is cloudy and chilly or sunny and warm; a third fact is, that just as an apple-tree produces small, sour fruit, if left in natural neglect, but delicious pippins, if a skilful gardener gives his attention to it; precisely so it is with morals. These three facts, soil, cultivation, and atmosphere, the variable and phenomenal phases of morals, together with its essential nature, are the true "Data of Ethics," and these we shall study in the first three chapters. In the remaining part

of the book we shall follow the growth of morality itself: the permanent, eternal essence of man, "the proper science and business of mankind in general," as Locke says.

This first chapter, then, will be devoted to the impending change in our industrial system. It may, therefore, contain little novel to Nationalists or Socialists. But I beg them to remember that this book is written mainly for outsiders; and also that these preliminaries are the necessary stepping-stones to what follows.

Few can deny that it is now a very barren soil. Carlyle sneers at the Englishman's hell: that of "not making money." But, surely, under our present system lack of wealth *is* hell, is a true penal servitude for a man's natural life, together with the torturing consciousness of leaving a like hopeless heritage to his offspring. With our present conception of life as a competitive race, property is the sole thing worth a sane man's pursuit, simply because we cannot be independent, indeed can scarcely be honest without it.

But is not such a life-theory about the most demoralising that could be promulgated? Certainly it is one which, systematically acted on, would be fatal to all high aims. "It is a conception of life which, if true, would make Falstaff the sensible fellow, and all disinterested servers of mankind noble fools." In what a terrible dilemma does the fact, that there is no safety for the unpropertied man, place us! How serious the responsibility for urging choice spirits to seek higher things than wealth!

Again, modern Political Economy, entirely disregarding the fact that both the Ancients and he who is called its founder insisted upon the unity of morals and economics, has entirely divorced them. Wealth has thus become an ultimate, instead of a mediate end, and this has caused Political Economy to be styled "the dismal science," for it sacrifices human beings to capital; and makes our national wealth, controlled by shrewd, capable men, whose object is gain, act like a malarial poison upon a population of operatives.

To expect robust morals from such a soil would be as unreasonable as to expect grapes from a vine planted on an iceberg. No wonder that our professional moral teachers are uncertain what to teach. In his so-called "*Science*" of *Ethics*, Leslie Stephen comes

to the conclusion, that "in exhorting a man to be virtuous, you exhort him to acquire a quality which will in many cases make him less fit than the less moral man for getting the greatest amount of happiness from a given combination of circumstances," and that "as a matter of fact, prudence and virtue often emphatically differ." But there is something worse yet. Not only is conventional morality nothing but calculating prudence, but our church morality makes selfishness an end; it makes one consider himself superior to others of his fellow-men; differentiates him from other poor sinners, and is thereby positively a vicious thing. No wonder that the blossom and fruit of such a morality must be correspondingly insignificant, to wit: a God who is simply a bulky policeman governed by partiality, and an Immortality, consisting in "such a good time" for our favoured selves in the next world, while the vast majority of the race goes to perdition.

But morality, true morality, is now avenged! Our present condition is such, that it may well be doubted if there ever were more misery in the midst of so much wealth.

We are fast coming to see that the production of wealth is *not* the chief interest of a nation; and also that Political Economy will be forever "dismal and accursed," if it does not change.

3. Sober and well-informed observers, however, perceive that a large social transformation is actually now going on. Unfortunately, many leaders of thought are yet profoundly ignorant respecting these matters. Never was I more amazed, than when I read in a work, published in 1889, on "State-Socialism," by Claudio Jannet, Professor of Political Economy at the Catholic Institute of Paris, these words: "The State must not pursue the chimera of bringing production and consumption into equilibrium. Observation, indeed, shows that there is in humanity, by reason of the original fall, a certain amount of economic suffering which no material progress can possibly remedy. The crises of over-production are the scourges inherent in our modern economic condition. Catholics who talk of suppressing our economic anarchy, and of harmony and equilibrium of interests, forget that one of the consequences of the fall of Adam has been to render labour

painful, *to make the earth grow thistles.*" (The professor's own italics!) "No progress of science, no social institutions, can ever make them disappear."

What a monumental stupidity in a modern Professor of Political Economy! But fortunately, day by day, thoughtful people are in greater numbers discarding the notion once almost universal, that social customs and institutions enter into the eternal order of things in such a way that any thorough-going change must involve universal ruin. The fact is being recognised, that our world is everywhere in a constant flux, is at every moment *becoming*, like a flowing river which is ever in a condition of change. There is, however, in this connection, another point of very great practical importance to which we shall several times in this essay have to recur, which is not sufficiently recognised, and about which even Herbert Spencer is apparently at sea, and this is that there are in human affairs two kinds of evolution which it is highly important to keep apart. There is the *natural* evolution—the only one that Spencer seems to recognise—and that other, brought about by the voluntary intervention of man: the *conscious* evolution. The latter will certainly by-and-by play far the most important role. That human intervention can modify social phenomena is the scientific foundation for all rational hope of a systematic reform of human affairs; but it is to natural evolution that we so far have been and, undoubtedly for some time yet to come, will be, almost exclusively, indebted for our progress.

Many have of late been studying this natural evolution, and think that they now clearly see the direction in which it works, in one word, its "trend." They think that they have especially learned the nature of the startling revolution through which our forefathers passed. The spirit of invention—the most important thing for our race since Christianity—had fallen upon them, stirred the human mind and given it a fresh impulse. This impulse has never ceased, but has multiplied human efforts in a hundred new directions and increased a hundredfold man's power over nature. In all civilised countries it has raised up from the masses the greatest plutocracy the world has ever seen, and this in a century which seemed bent on making equality one of

its chief social goals—a plutocracy that is now everywhere at its zenith.

But events are still marching on with their relentless logic. Nowhere has this plutocracy had such perfect liberty of action as in the United States. And there has now come over industry and business here a startling change which is going on with such rapidity as to suggest the complete abandonment of the principle by which the industries of the nation have hitherto been developed. This change is the formation of the “trust:” the merging of our corporations into a body, outside the control and ignoring the consent of the State, a body whose Executive Board has full power of management and full authority to limit or centralize production, consolidate establishments, purchase raw materials, and supervise selling prices, terms and conditions. The object of this is greater, regularity of production, steadiness of prices, and a uniform system of credit, as well as the prevention of unhealthy competition.

But this phenomenon has an inner, underlying meaning. It presents the question, whether under present conditions society can continue to develop normally and healthfully in all its parts. In particular, it brings before the public mind the dilemma: whether we are to have organized capital, or organized government; for this one thing is perfectly evident, that we must in the future have organized business action of some sort. In other words, it prepares the public mind, as nothing else could, for—Socialism.

Observe, there is a good kind, and a bad kind of Socialism, a Socialism of mutual good will and mutual help as well as a Socialism of hatred and spoliation. It is the good kind that is here meant, what we now in America call “Nationalism.”

The fact is that competition is the individualistic way of doing business, and combination, the principle of the trust, is the socialistic way. Every trust is a concession to Socialism and its working principles. It is even more: it is a practical confession of the socialist charges, that competition necessarily involves great waste, and that by concentration the cost of production can be materially lessened; while at the same time the market can be so controlled that no goods need remain unsold. Thus, to take

but one example, the Whisky Trust, consisting of eighty distilleries, absolutely finds its advantage in operating but thirteen.

This is an exceedingly important matter and points to several lessons that should be learned by the public precisely at this moment. It shows how blindly and stubbornly our political leaders persist in leading the wrong way. Everyone knows that just now the Courts of New York are trying to put down the Sugar Trust by declaring this combination to be for an "unlawful object." But what matter how many thousand times unlawful a thing may be, if it only be in the direction of progress, which this evidently is? What should be seen by our leaders is, that a "Trust" is a use of Socialism for the benefit of capitalists; and attention should be called to the practicability of socialist principles everywhere, and the lesson taught that in no country can these principles be so easily and quickly applied to business life as here. If this natural evolution be simply allowed to go on, and no stumbling-blocks be put in its way, in a very short time, certainly by the commencement of the twentieth century, we shall find all social activities conducted by Trusts, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. What then?

Few people pause to consider that the year 2000 is not farther ahead of us than the American Revolution is behind us: that it is our grandchildren who will then be living. Still fewer reflect upon the extent to which we shall have grown in all respects by that time, not only in population, in wealth, and in the concentration of wealth, but, if things continue as they are, also in misery and discontent. Can any sensible man doubt that long before that time our children will demand a radical change? And will they not trust their own Government, properly organised, rather than organised capital? The State is already becoming a very practical power among us in the regulation of industry and in assuming what have hitherto been regarded as private functions. The Inter-State Commerce Law is an indication. As Higginson says pointedly: "Since Government can profitably conduct a bankrupt railroad by means of a receiver, a good many persons come to think that it can also carry on a successful one."

The outcome, then, that all this points to is, that our children

will second this natural evolution by eliminating all useless functionaries—those whose only “function” is to put the profit into their own pockets—and by placing the central management in the hands of the collectivity. Our country, being a self-contained one, is for that reason precisely the one that ought to take the lead in inaugurating Socialism. There is even now no more inherent improbability of a Socialist State than there was two hundred years ago of Democracy. Meanwhile, by the full information which they are now collecting relative to the various productive agencies, the Trusts are preparing for such Government control.

4. It is really a curious fact, and one that furnishes food for reflection, that while our people are shuddering at the spectre of destructive Socialism, there is being constructed under our very eyes a socialist régime, showing us how the environment of the individual will be changed.

What we now especially suffer from is planlessness; what we need and must have, what the coming social order will give us, and what the “Trust” to some extent already provides, is *system*.

Planlessness, anarchy, is the great trouble, inherent in our industrial system. Division of labour, as everyone knows, is our great principle, but it has peculiar dangers. No one now does the whole of anything, but hands his work over to men of complementary trades; further, our greatest industries are those which turn out parts only of things, parts which in themselves are useless for human needs, if not complemented by other processes. This is the world's industry, carried on as a vast co-operation of labour—an extremely complicated machine in which each trade represents a wheel. Such a machine makes exceptional demands on the organising powers of the human brain. The organisation of industry, as we know it, is kept going by the individual self-interest of many men, working without the knowledge one of another, or of one another's doings and intentions. Everyone is thus guessing, and generally guessing pretty wildly; the wonder then is, not that there is periodical depression, but that the industrial machine works at all. The very perfection of organised

and divided labour demands system: that is the keystone which is to unite the infinity of human wants and the willingness of unemployed hands. Its proper working absolutely requires one mind to look after it, that all its parts may be balanced and harmonious. Suppose that one head could say to the planters: "Next season our country will need so many thousand bales of cotton;" to the spinners: "Have your spindles ready to take up so many bales;" to the weavers: "Be ready to weave so much yarn," there would, of course, be insured a steady demand, a steady supply, continuity of employment, and an absence of depression everywhere.

In this connection, it is important to note that by the actual state of things the labouring classes have been more pinched than any other classes of society, and that this has made them more far- and clear-seeing—self-conscious. It is this that has made them form their Trades Unions, in which they have had to postpone their private interests and defer their personal judgments to those of their fellows and their class. And this brings us to a proposition, of a most remarkable kind, considering the source whence it emanates, which is none other than Wm. H. Mallock, who certainly is best known by his anti-socialistic crusade. He, in a late paper, proposes to incorporate Trades Unions in a closer and more recognised way, "in the life of the country;" to enlarge their powers and character, and at the same time to define their limits, so that they may come to embrace all the various divisions of the labouring population. He contends that "the welfare of the country depends on a balance between the claims, not of a numerical majority and a numerical minority, but of a variety of bodies that rank as equals on account of the *equally essential services* which each renders to the community." He goes on to advocate that such legally recognised labour organisations should represent all interests common to all working-men, "as distinct from exceptional talent," and be enabled to enforce their claims, should form "an estate of the realm," as he terms it. "The justification of such an arrangement," he adds, "lies deep in the nature of things, and is the only one in complete harmony with facts," and is "the only way to lift the masses into a recognised

and permanent place in the solid structure of the Commonwealth." This remarkable advance by Mallock is, in truth, a theoretical concession to Socialism—as the trust is a practical concession,—showing that it is in "complete harmony with facts," and has the force of logic on its side, for the above proposition is virtually what Socialists and organised labour reformers contend for. We all know how objectionable the "scab" is to the latter; nothing, certainly, would please the organised workers better than to see the law compel all workers to enter a Union, submit to the collective judgment of their trade, and concur in electing representatives who should watch over and force forward labour's interests in the management of the shop and store, as Charles Francis Adams, jun., President of the Union Pacific Co., has lately suggested in regard to railroad employees.

"But it is a pity if an employer cannot manage his own business to suit himself." It may be a pity, but it is true, even now, that this is exactly what he cannot do. The truth is, it is not "his own" business; the men are in reality his business partners, and he must manage the business in their interest as well as his own.

Well, when the people resolve to have done with all private business, and to disestablish Trusts, what about the "sacredness of property?" This simply means, that what the law pronounces "property" is sacred. The law so styles it because it is thought most expedient for the social welfare, but as soon as it is found expedient to announce that for the future certain forms of wealth shall not be "property," that they shall be used in certain ways and not in "certain other ways," it will also be discovered that the State has a perfect right to do this, and that for the wealth thus appropriated a Socialist State can without difficulty compensate, to its full value,—*without interest*. Moreover, whenever wealth is the fruit of little labour, and much questionable manipulation, and audacious gambling, under legal forms, such property is easily regarded as much less sacred, and the legalisation as much less divine.

Those who are fond of assuming a nation's inability to manage business affairs should be asked to read in Adam Smith the passage which criticises public management. Here they will find enum-

erated certain enterprises which that author regarded as necessarily private, and which, nevertheless, are now in the hands of the State. Indeed, this assumption is now entirely obsolete, since so many enterprises have taken the form of limited, or joint-stock companies, the managers of which have no more personal interest in them than has the superintendent of a well-conducted public office in it. Such a business can now, without the least difficulty, be transferred into the hands of the public without any change in the system of administration.

Albert Stickney has written a book to convince his readers that the most pressing political need of the people of the United States is the calling of a national constitutional convention, in accordance with the provisions of our present constitution, to consider the question of constitutional amendments. This is, undoubtedly, the desirable way to make our country a Socialist republic. But it is very fortunate, that there is no prospect of such a convention during the next quarter of a century, or before the natural evolution can have done its work of enlightening the people. It will need that length of time at least, for the interested capitalists know how to create public sentiment in their favour, and to them is due all the talk about the inability and the corruption of the State. The more lucrative a private enterprise is, and therefore the greater need that society should conduct it in the interest and for the benefit of all, the stronger will private parties oppose the change. Meanwhile all our influence should be directed toward inciting or compelling the party (or rather the faction), that in principles stands nearest to us, to apply the principles of Socialism to enterprises wherein the Constitution is no obstacle; and, on reflection, we may find a great number of instances where the several States can adopt these principles to the great advantage of their people.

5. We now come to the very kernel of this preliminary—the first great proximate effect of a Socialist régime.

This is *Increased Production*, the second great desideratum of our times, but to which the Trusts do not help us a bit. They

do bring harmony between production and consumption, but this they do precisely by decreasing the former.

It is a most profound truth which Professor Walker teaches: "We need a new Adam Smith, to write the economics of consumption, in which will be found the real dynamics of wealth;" yet a truth to which our employers seem totally blind, since they behave as if it were their ideal to have production carried on without "hands" at all, except perhaps a stoker and an engineer. They seem constantly to lose sight of the fact, that their boots and shoes and other products are not consumed by people of another planet; that we are not even in the position of England, whose products still, to a great extent, are consumed by foreigners—while we produce for our own people. Suppose, then, each large factory could produce millions of dollars worth of goods with but a stoker and an engineer, would not these goods be valueless in the hands of producers, since the masses could not buy them, however much they might want them? Of what use is a wealth of nails if they cannot be sold? This is brought into still stronger relief in cases where the "wealth" is in products that only serve as raw materials for other processes—these, when not sold, being entirely valueless.

Consumption, especially in our country, is, then, truly "the real dynamics of wealth." Increased production can be sustained only by increased consumption, and thus the latter is the *first* consideration. It is impossible to emphasise this point too much; we cannot too strongly insist, that current political economy is "dismal," merely because it has an eye for nothing but production. It is with that as with happiness—in order to attain it, you must not make it your goal. Our capacity for production is already absolutely boundless; it only needs a sufficient stimulus: consumption is that stimulus, and the urgent question is how the coming change will affect consumption.

If one go to the root of the matter it will be found that the present economic system—because it is a "wage" and a "profit" system—artificially limits consumption and destroys the purchasing power of the masses. In thus doing, it chokes production as if with a ring of granite, just as much as, by bringing inventions,

machinery and the division of labour to their present state, it at first advanced it. What is now needed is simply to destroy this granite ring, to abolish this profit-mongering, to promote production for the satisfaction of social wants, and consumption will then immediately vastly increase and this will expand production with a rebound. This is what Nationalism or Socialism means and what it purposes doing: to enable society—the nation, state, or municipality, each in its proper sphere—to set all willing hands and brains to work, by furnishing them the necessary capital; then we shall have, not the artificial harmony between production and consumption which the trusts create, but perfect natural harmony between the capacity for producing and the capacity for consuming, both of which are even now illimitable. No pampering, no poverty any longer, but the whole country vibrating with the music of joyful labour!

It must be evident that this will be a far greater blessing of Socialism than the equitable distribution which hitherto, even by Socialists, has been thought to be its greatest effect. What need we care, if a few get more than their share, if only all others can have all that they need? But profit-mongering must go, and its abolition, Mallock warns us, will be disastrous.

He claims that the 500 million pounds, which is now annually produced in Great Britain, over and above the incomes of forty years ago, by an equal number of workers, are “evidently” not the product of labour, but of the “ability” of the Minority. Then he criticises the position of this writer in these words: “Laurence Gronlund has been misled in his belief that each step of industrial progress is a step which, once gained, is gained forever, and that the capitalistic classes have done their work and given to energy all the productivity required. This is a delusion. Whatever ability has been needed to cause progress is needed to keep it from retrogression. The progress of the life of Society must forever be formed and maintained by the Minority.” Therefore the coming democracy will have to be careful not to “rob the world of wealth and leisure, the main sources of progressive industrial energy, of their prizes,” *i.e.*, of the results of profit-mongering, or we shall surely return to barbarism.

The place and function of THE ABLE MAN in a Socialist Commonwealth will be hereafter discussed ; in this place I will say merely a few words about Mallock's "ability," which is supposed to have created the above surplus, and which makes its activity contingent upon profits.

He has in another place explained it. He supposes a capitalist to buy a bankrupt factory, and during the first year to make a profit of 100,000 dols. by changing, in an infinitesimal degree, the products to suit the fancy of certain customers. This profit, and the whole of it, he now claims to be the fruit, exclusively, of the "ability" of this capitalist, and to belong, and to belong justly to him, and to him alone. You are perfectly right, we reply ; under the present competitive system it would be sheer folly to confiscate these profits for the benefit of the operatives, simply because under this system it is the special function of the wise organiser and manager to keep a watchful eye on what consumers need, and to have it ready at the time and place, and in the form in which it is wanted, and in no greater quantities than is needed. But in the Socialist republic, while the Able Man will be far more in demand than now, this special sort of "ability" will become perfectly superfluous, because system will have been introduced everywhere. No huge quantities of goods will then be produced in anticipation of an uncertain demand ; no guesswork and no secrecy will be requisite anywhere.

In passing, it may be remarked, that the functions of the capitalistic employer of a hundred years ago and the period immediately following are in our time being increasingly performed by salaried managers of impersonal companies, officials who certainly ought to find their advantage in being turned into the ministers of a democratic state.

And this has the closest possible connection with the movement, soon to assume practical shape in our country, for a normal working day of eight hours. In this connection it is worth while to recall Professor Walker's declaration : "self-assertion by the working classes is an important factor in the beneficent distribution of wealth—" and, we add, in the *production* of wealth. Organised labour proves itself far more intelligent and clear-

sighted than does such a journal as the *New York Evening Post*, when it sneeringly asks, "if reduction of hours of labour leads to increased production, why should not the condition of the race be infinitely improved by a general cessation of industry?"

Organised labour can give the *Post* the economic instruction it so sadly needs. The lack of consumption in "the masses," of which we have spoken, is almost synonymous with the low level of "working-class" comfort, because (though of course the wage-workers are not literally the same as the masses, and still less are the labourers out of employment), depression in one place quickly propagates itself by contagion. We are, in other words, shut up in a circle: we cannot have steady production if we have not steady consumption; we cannot have the latter if the workers, and all the workers, are not kept in steady production. A reduction in the hours of labour will certainly have the result of giving employment and decent wages to the large numbers of labourers now in enforced idleness, and thereby of increasing the effective demand—the ability to buy—of the entire working-class. Again, such a reduction will increase the intelligence, the good-will and the social estimation in which the labourer is held, and that, in subtle ways, will react on production, both as to quantity and quality.

6. We have now reached the second proximate effect of a Socialistic régime and the immediate consequence of System and Abundance: of *Independence or Freedom*, as opposed to the insecurity—or so-called *Liberty*, which is now the lot of the masses. The conception of life as a "competitive race" is bad enough, but even this is only for the comfortable ones. Most men do not know about any "race;" they have trouble enough to *live*. Ask them what they are striving for, and they will reply: "God knows, we have no time to think of the future; we have enough to do in protecting ourselves and our children from the pressure of the present." The great crime of the fortunate ones has been that hitherto they have neither known, nor cared to know, how the vast majority lives, but have stood aloof from it and left it in degrading want and abject helplessness.

Look at the wage-earner in steady employment and see what his "independence" in this blessed country amounts to. The Census of 1880 tells us that the average wage is less than seven dols. a week. The chiefs of labour statistics in two of the most favoured states of the Union, Massachusetts in the East, and Illinois in the West, inform us that the majority of working-men, those who are sober and industrious, cannot make both ends meet, without sending their tender children to the factory. And for the privilege of earning this "livelihood" the wage-earner is indebted to the *favour* of some individual, his master, upon whose will and whim he is constantly dependent during the whole term of his employment.

The wage system is founded on the pestilent heresy, that labour is a commodity, a ware. By denouncing this doctrine in their late pastoral the bishops of the Episcopal Church nobly did their duty. The worst effect of the system, that which makes it almost satanic, is, not that it makes some rich and makes others poor, but that, by placing one class in the power of the other, to be used as means to its ends, it destroys all truly human relations, fills the one with lordly hauteur, the other with servility, divides the nation against itself and defeats the ends of humanity.

Ah, but what shall we, then, say of those who can find no work, who would consider themselves happy, blessed, if they had a "master?" That is the terrible fact which finally moved Mallock. He now admits that insecurity is the real injury to, and grievance of, the modern labourer. "To be discharged means to be cut off from society, thrust out of all connection with civilisation; this makes want of employment a real torture to him. Not alone the actual pain of being out of work for a time, but the anxiety the worker experiences in securing another engagement—all this forms not alone inconvenience, but sometimes bitterness, and, more than that, it is a constant reminder to him how insecure is his tenure of his individual share in civilisation." Now, the nationalisation of industries will necessarily be attended with the following results :

First, everyone will become a public functionary and will be entitled to suitable work from the Commonwealth. Our progress

so far has been from *status* to *contract*—the latter, we shall afterwards see, can be but a transition stage; we shall in the future have status once more, but on a higher plane; formerly, birth determined condition, henceforth capacity will be the controlling factor. Dependence on individuals and on their pleasure will consequently cease, while all, without exception, will equally depend on the impersonal collectivity in a far purer form than do our present public functionaries who owe far more to favour than to merit.

This demands a true civil service reform. It is to be regretted that the petitions for a national telegraph system did not embrace a demand for an administrative system, similar to what President Adams proposes for railroad employees. In substance this would consist of a Board, nominated by the employees, which would have to adjudicate upon all grievances, secure to those already in the service tenure during good behaviour and due promotion to even the highest places, as well as to make all new appointments. A similar system should apply to each service as soon as nationalised.

Professor Graham insists that there are three “deep, dominant and not decreasing” desires, which the social system of the future must not contravene. The first of these is freedom of speech and action; that, we now have shown, will be guaranteed by Socialism.

Second, we can surely say, without here entering into details, that there will result a more equitable distribution of wealth, which has hitherto been thought to be the principal effect of Socialism, but which we have seen must give precedence to increase of production. Without discussing the principle of distribution, we can say that those performing the lowest offices will be paid sufficient to lead a life worthy of a man; and that disagreeableness of occupation will increase rather than diminish the pay. Imagine the man carting muck paid as well as he who sells tape! This alone will grind existing arrangements to powder. Hence, we insist, that Professor Graham’s second desire—“the instinct,” as he calls it, “of private property”—will also be gratified by Socialism. Far from doing away with private property, it

will enable everybody to acquire property; it will consecrate it by placing it on the unimpeachable basis of personal, useful effort. If a man desires to accumulate and save his earnings, let him do so, and let him use them in any way he pleases, except in fleecing his fellow-citizens therewith. How tremendous will be the gain to Society when pauperism, the social Inferno which is the shame and danger of our civilisation, has disappeared! This pauperism is nothing but the necessary fruit of the wage-system which imperatively requires a reserve army of labourers.

Third, Graham's last "deep and dominant" desire—"free scope for choosing one's career," with all that this implies, will to an extent now unknown be guaranteed by Socialism, as everyone must see on reflection.

At present it is almost exclusively chance that determines one's career. Under Socialism the youth will, first, have every opportunity of discovering that for which he is especially adapted; and it will be to the interest of Society that he be assigned a place in conformity with his capacity. Then, he will enter a Trades Union which, as "an estate of the realm," in Mallock's language, will do its work in perfect liberty, subject only to the superintendence of the central management. Rules, of course, there must be; but they will mainly be such as are made by the Union of which he is an active member; *i.e.*, they will be self-made.

7. But we have not finished with the hardships of which the new order will relieve the wage-earners and which have now to be borne by them, unknown to our comfortable people. Insecurity and dependence are bad enough; but how many of our leisured class ever reflect upon what it means to toil day in and day out, from early morning till six at night, merely for a living, for a livelihood, that, as we have seen, cannot in the majority of cases make both ends meet? And, mark, this is the lot of the more fortunate portion of the masses! Think of this, for once, and say, if it be not an outrage, that our "glorious" civilization has brought the masses nothing but the poor privilege of living in order that they may work?

The masses now groan, some under excess of toil, others under

its monstrous opposite, enforced idleness. Socialism will give them blessed *Leisure*. There is a radical distinction between leisure and idleness. The former means the free time that follows upon a proper period of pleasant labour, rewarded by a secured, decent existence. Enforced idleness is infinitely worse than toil, is the industrial horror that serves as invisible chains, more potent than actual chains, to keep the modern serf to his daily task, in-as-much as for him who is emancipated a more terrible fate is in store: that of being suspended over the abyss of pauperism.

To live in order to work—what a miserable contrast to “to work in order to live!” That life was given us to enjoy, few in their sober senses doubt. “The earth is arranged to be a scene of enjoyments for all—for the greatest number at least; a few possibly are destined to the grander, and, to them, the more congenial task of being severely but divinely sad.” So clear is this, that we cannot hesitate to pronounce that the man who is not happy is not fulfilling the purpose of his existence. I do not forget, I rather wish to note, that it is not only the toilers, but frequently also the employers, who suffer from lack of leisure. We need only to recall what physicians tell us, that they meet with numerous instances of nervous exhaustion among merchants and manufacturers, a consequence of the great strain which the industrial leaders are under to attain the impossible—and this is as little from choice with them as with the operatives. Among that class we find weariness, satiety of material sweets, ruined nerves, and the relish for life gone.

The more we study these facts, the nearer we arrive at the certainty that the scantiness of man’s joys is traceable to his unskilful use of the existing provisions, and to his contravention of the evident design, and that this scantiness is the fruit of our industrial system.

It is, further, noteworthy that this lack of leisure is very unprofitable to society. Genius is now looked upon as a rare gem, and mediocrity is considered rather our normal condition. This, as Lester Ward insists upon, is not at all as it should be. As a matter of fact, in all the civilized nations, and certainly not least among Americans, there is an abundance of genius everywhere,

and again, there is a complete equality among the different classes, in the sense that the opportunities for discovering native genius are the same in the various classes. Yes, even in the "dregs" of society, in "the belly of the abyss," there are men of genius; men intended for poets, philosophers, artists, inventors, equipped and endowed by nature for such careers, may be found in the mournful company of the "lack-alls." "What might be grain is now grass, because, especially by their excessive hours of labour, these classes are crushed into a condition far below their possibilities." All that is required to find and expand this genius is to extend opportunity to all members of society—particularly leisure. Then so-called feats of genius will be found to be the normal activity of the race.

Our "self-made" men show what grand individual types our working classes may develop—no, we might rather say, they do *not* show, and cannot show this at all, because the way by which they have raised themselves is radically wrong. In order to succeed, they have had to carry on a life-long battle against obstacles, to display inordinate individuality, amounting to conceit, thus immensely narrowing their mental horizon. For, observe, genius is *not* strengthened by struggling, as is generally supposed. It is universally true that real greatness is timid; the finer it is in quality, the more it recoils from obstacles and shrinks from hostility; true merit, indeed, as a rule, never creates its opportunities. Society has hitherto lost tremendously by its negligence. Merely by furnishing leisure and opportunity Socialism will convert latent talent into an enormous civilising force, of which the little that now shines forth is but a glimmer.

8. For the purpose of this essay, it is assumed that all these acquisitions, Leisure, Security and Plenty are, within a measurable period, to become the birthright of all as the products of natural evolution. We have a right to assume this, for everyone who will open his eyes and be honest to himself must admit that the tendency of things is in this direction. Of course, we cannot dispute with Professor Gide of Montpellier, France, his right to

say that he believes this tendency will soon be reversed.¹ All signs and portents show that the face of mankind has already been set in a socialist direction, and so far there has been no looking backward. And as it has been, so will it continue to be, a matter of *natural* evolution, of which the change in our brains forms part. There has been the access of a new, radical, divine order in human life, that is disintegrating the old, outworn, temporary organisation, and gradually creating the new. When the socialist *régime* is born, then will it be time for society to second this natural evolution, time for the conscious evolution. Lester F. Ward² is premature when he insists we should commence now and begin with education. Mankind will not be ready for this until hunger has ceased and leisure has been obtained.

But these attainments, far from being the end, form but the starting point. Here is where Herbert Spencer is radically wrong. He, who knows nothing of men's assisting natural evolution, fancies that this transition principle of competition and "sphere of contract" will ultimately lead us to what he apparently considers an ideal state:

"A Society is conceivable of men leading inoffensive lives, scrupulously fulfilling their contracts, who yet yield to each other no other advantage beyond those agreed upon."

To this it may be observed, first, that in supposing it possible that the present system could ever bring in such a social state, Spencer proves himself a true representative "middle-class" man; for a distinguishing trait of the present narrow-minded ruling classes, the "bourgeoisie," is the assumption that everyone is, or might and ought to be, a "bourgeois." Next, it is doubtful whether a society like the above is conceivable, except it be composed of a crowd of monads, each governed by independent, inherent laws. At all events I deliberately avow my firm conviction, that a company composed of all the present inmates of our penitentiaries would be preferable to such an "ideal" community; these would, at any rate, be men with human virtues as

¹ I, however, understand, that M. Gide, ed. of *La Revue Economique*, now admits this to be a mistake.

² In *Dynamic Sociology*.

well as frailties. Again, if the evolution in the midst of which we now find ourselves should issue in such a race of "bourgeois," "scrupulously fulfilling their contracts:" if it should end by merely procuring material well-being to all the inhabitants of the United States, *and nothing further*, I frankly declare that I would not lift my little finger to help bring about such a result. And I have had a sufficiently practical, though a short, experience of such a community, for Spencer's "ideal State" is actually realised on a small scale in our day. I refer to the so-called *Familistère* in Guise, France, founded thirty years ago, by the late M. Godin. This is the only successful instance of the practical application of Fourierism to business, a wave of which in the forties passed over the United States and resulted in several short-lived experiments, like the Brook Farm, scarcely any of which survived into their teens. At Guise nearly 2,000 persons live together in two huge buildings, and enjoy some of the material advantages which we have supposed Socialism will bring to our people. They have an abundance of the necessaries and material comforts of life and enjoy security of existence. They do not work quite so many hours a day as is usual in France, and have somewhat higher wages, together with uninterrupted employment. In addition to this, if their income, for any reason, falls short of a given minimum, they are compensated from a fund set apart for that purpose; if they fall sick they are paid from the sick fund, and on reaching old age they receive a pension. Among them pauperism, and we may say poverty in its harshest form, are thus unknown. If this result could be accomplished throughout such a country as ours, a great step, undoubtedly, would have been taken. Godin has done this great thing: shown that it can be done. He said to this writer: "Make of France 18,000 Familistères and *la misère* is abolished." Very true. But he added, "and the social problem is solved." Oh, no! It is just when I imagine the United States divided into 23,000 such "Familistères" that I shudder, and decline to move a finger to help to bring it about.

For that something is the matter appears from this fact; now and then one of the intelligent Parisian artisans, moved by the evident material advantages of the institution, goes there, but if

he has means to get away, he hardly ever stays more than three months. Then he directs his steps back to Paris. What is the matter?

The truth is, this so-called "Social Palace" is not at all a "Socialistic Model," as Godin unfortunately held it up to be. Intellectually and, moreover, socially, it is a failure. The people are unsocial and unsympathetic; there are absolutely no social gatherings, no clubs, no literary or debating societies among them, as one would naturally expect; and the reason is a simple one: the material success as well as the failures are due to the character of the founder. It will sound incredible, when I say, as I do on good authority, that during the thirty years of the existence of the institution, Godin, a social reformer, never once crossed the thresholds of the people, among whom he resided, to sympathise with them or press their hands in token of his sharing their joys and their sorrows. This characterises his sociability and explains that of his people. His intellectual standing will be sufficiently shown by stating that he habitually consulted his "spirit friends," and that his principal efforts to raise his people intellectually consisted in attempts to initiate them into Spiritualism. It may be added, that respecting Karl Marx he once made this remark to the writer: "Pooh! he did not found a *Familistère*!"

But in Godin's experiment we have indeed Spencer's ideal: "an industrious people, leading inoffensive lives, and scrupulously fulfilling their contracts, but yielding to each other no advantages beyond their contracts." The *Familistère* was, indeed, worth the three months' study that I devoted to it, if simply to become convinced that material well-being is not sufficient for a people and *must not be made an end*. But yet for all intellectual and moral advancement it is a pre-requisite as necessary as the soil. Subserviency to material interests has hitherto degraded human life to the ground, but ere long, by providing for his honest, orderly, physical subsistence, society will relieve everyone of her members from this, and leave the heart and the mind free for higher aspirations.

This chapter commenced with noting the fundamental difference between this book and the *The Service of Man*. It is now evident

that we have made our start, not from the clouds, like *Is Life Worth Living?* but from our actual environment. The next chapter will—unlike the *Data of Ethics*, which derives our whole manhood from our animal basis—emphasise the higher element in human nature, which I maintain is fully as much a *fact* as our animal inheritance, that is, we shall pass to the examination of the *essence of morality*.

CHAPTER II.

THE SOCIAL BOND.

morality would subsist to all eternity, though all religions were swept
livion."— *W. S. Lilly.*

The great question is: Will the future society be a pigsty, with well-fed hogs, or the kingdom of heaven on earth? answer depends, I hold, entirely on what morality really is. ymen look upon morality as mere sentiment, really of no al import to themselves. The first Napoleon stands for a lass of brainy, practical intellects, who see in it something r bibs and tuckers and stupid people. Our churches teach ost equally mischievous doctrine, that it mainly serves to us into saints and sinners. This depreciation and mis-ension of true morality constitutes our greatest mis-, and is the main cause why we all, even men of the t material and mental endowments, lead such unsatisfactory

uently believe I have something important to say on this . It is, that Socialism, so despised or so feared by my nen in their blindness, is, if profoundly studied, a bearer of ation to us: that it reveals morality in all its grand ions, and shows it to us as the prize of life, the proper of our life work.

must start from a point that all will agree upon.

, our world is a cosmos, a world of Order. *Morality is an ig of this Order*, of the Empire of Necessity that surrounds

most persistent advocates of Free-will must agree to this tion as well as the firmest "Determinists." In spite of taphysical differences, that is what we all rely upon in

practice. Whenever governments legislate to restrain crime, whenever teachers train pupils, whenever political economists put their theories into practice, they all assume, that by influencing motives, they can direct the actions both of so-called "good" and "bad" men. And what a fatal possession would an absolutely free will be to us! It would in truth be an evil, more disastrous than any actual misery whatever to which we are now subject. If something, if sympathy and duty could not determine our will, we should constantly tremble at thinking what our actions would be the next moment. It is because our will fortunately is not "free" in this sense, that we feel insulted by being supposed capable of a mean action; and that men of healthy judgment know that every man cannot be bribed, and every woman cannot be led astray. Aye, hence it is that every one of us now relies, even for life itself, on the aptitude and integrity of a multitude of unknown agents, whose folly or wickedness might effect the destruction of us all. Could we possibly be tranquil for a single moment if the locomotive engineer was not every moment subject to ordinary motives? All co-operation depends on our *not* being "free."

But, like thoughtless children, we do not reflect on the inner meaning and significance of this suggestive fact. This empire of necessity which science everywhere discloses in the world of mind as of matter, in the succession of thoughts and volitions is not a prison, is not a tyrannical master that necessarily oppresses us. It does not make this world a world of fatalism, but it does forbid anarchy and makes it a world of order. It prevents us from making a tangle of existence. Indeed, natural evolution has prepared for us a path from which it has been made impossible for us to deviate considerably. And it has done very much more. Far from being a necessity to which we only can bow our heads, we, by that very necessity, acquire practical freedom as soon as we come to self-consciousness. By obeying nature, we rule it. By knowledge of its uniform behaviour, we can press the laws into our service; the more completely nature, including our own bodily and mental states, passes under the dominion of established laws, the more we can avail ourselves of them. We can increase,

vary, modify, neutralise the operation of laws, but only by the action of other laws. We can summon one law to our aid, to deliver us from the evil effect of another law. Though each item of our deliberation is controlled by motives, we can labour for distant ends and choose appropriate means to reach a foreseen goal. As we progress, less of chance is pressing on us and more choice allowed us. We may even be able to subdue the maleficent forms of disease. This very necessity, while it prescribes to us our goal and our destiny, makes us the seconders, *the co-workers of natural evolution*, and to that extent "in action like an angel, in comprehension like God."

Again, this empire of necessity lays the foundation for the important distinction, later to be made, between conventional morality and true morality. The delusion, that we are wholly the smiths of our own character, has filled our "moral" men, who never experienced temptation, with a foolish, selfish, anti-social pride, divided us into two bodies, each going its separate way to all eternity, and nourished a sneaking private design on God's bounty in the shape of personal salvation. But the empire of necessity, when it is thoroughly appreciated, will lead to three important conclusions. First, it will demolish this unsocial pride and teach us that a criminal who has at times loved what is good, true and beautiful, and has striven after it, is nobler than a "moral" man who is selfish and never has wished to become better. Second, that there is a spark of the divine in even our thieves and murderers; that they are what they are, to a great extent, because our better circumstanced people have kept aloof from them; and third, that our destiny, whatever it be, is the same for us all. Sir James Stephen very strongly blames the sentimental twaddle of indiscriminate love for all humanity, and insists that it is part of a wholesome character to detest sin and wickedness. True enough, but at the same time we shall be made to understand that the Empire of Necessity is a fact which imposes upon us a burden we cannot throw off: to look after and improve our bad characters.

Thus *Order is the natural foundation for Socialism*, and so far from disposing us to inaction, regulates our activity, so as to in-

crease its range and render it effective. A vagrant and visionary liberty—because after all in constant subjection to unforeseen influences, external and internal—is thus superceded by a noble law of common progress, which not only regulates the individual, but combines bodies of men, fostering the dispositions that bring men together and suppressing those which put men asunder.

10. Now what is Morality? I answer, just as a physical “law” is the expression of the relation of the order of the world to things, so Morality is the expression of its relation to men. As a preliminary definition, we can say that Morality is *the force that binds men in Societies*, as the force of gravitation binds men to the earth.

This *fact* shows us the blunder in the position of the Anarchists. One of their spokesmen says: “the duty of the individual to sacrifice himself to God, the state, the community, the ‘cause’ of anything is a superstition that always makes for tyranny.” In other words they stubbornly refuse to see facts as they are. Is it not poor philosophy to call a “superstition” that fact of whose existence their own disciples furnish abundant proof? What individuals have in their generation more readily sacrificed themselves for a “cause” than the Russian and the Chicago Anarchists? The worst in these teachings, however, is, not that it is poor philosophy, but that it is shockingly and dangerously *immoral*.

Yet this must be granted: that the Anarchists are logical, far more logical than Herbert Spencer; it is their premises that are wrong. These premises are furnished them by Spencer’s *Data of Ethics* and Mill’s *Utilitarianism*, to wit: that we are a crowd of monads, each governed by independent, inherent laws, and that we have come into this life, each for the sake of himself—these doctrines are a corollary to Spencer’s ideal state, and Mill’s teaching that sexual “experiments in living” are outside the sphere of social sanction, and that men have always acted, and particularly have formed society, from motives of utility. These teachings, carried out to their logical conclusion, evidently end in Anarchism.

But these doctrines are false; they do not harmonize with facts.

Take the last. A social state would never have existed, if its rise had depended on a conviction of its utility to the individual. Such utility did not and could not manifest itself till after a long preparatory development of the society which it was supposed to have created. And then the fact is, that its utility is less than its burdens. No, undoubtedly, society arose from a radically different cause, one that is in the closest possible connection with our definition of Morality. We have said that it is "the force that binds us together in Society" and it is this same force, *an innate, social sentiment, that originally drew man and his fellows together*, and in so doing formed Society—whether clan, tribe or nation. A far more correct conception of the matter than is enunciated by Spencer with his "monad" theory, and the old philosopher, Aristotle, when he defined man as a "social animal;" that is to say, that only in unity with one's fellows does the individual *ego* realize its true being. To be "moral" can thus be said to be synonymous with being "social" in its profound sense.

But let us go deeper. To form a Society and live in it involves *co-operation* from the start; this, again, elementary subordination; that is to say, both in forming Society and co-operating with our fellows we—*obey*. To be sure, this word in our age of individualism is almost tabooed; at least, it jars on our nerves, but it really cannot be helped; if we honestly interpret the facts of existence, we must say that to obey is the very foundation both of society and sociology. Indeed, we may say, that the germ of morals is, in its very essence, *obedience*. Man is truly made to obey, and to feel remorse if he does not obey.

There is a much stronger inclination to obedience in the generality of men than it is customary in our day to suppose. If men were as rebellious as they are represented to be, it would be difficult to see how they ever could have been disciplined. I affirm, on the contrary, that there is in all of us a natural disposition to obedience; it is certain that we are all of us more or less disposed to respect any real superiority, especially intellectual and moral, in others, independently of any advantage that may accrue to us. Who, in these anarchic times of ours, has not in his secret mind often felt how sweet it would be to obey, if he could have the rare

privilege of assigning burdensome responsibility for his conduct to wise guidance?—a feeling, in fact, strongest in those best fitted to rule. Indeed, as to the *fact* of obedience, there is no difference between the Anarchists and us; the difference comes in somewhere else. They obey as much as anybody. Whenever the spirit of revolutionary destruction was abroad in France, the hottest revolutionists manifested a scrupulous obedience to their chosen guides. Trades Unionists are distinguished by their perfect trust and confidence in their leaders. The instinct of submission is so great in us that we lavish it far too often on deceptive appearances.

But obedience is one side of the shield, the other is—*authority*. Here is where the difference comes in. Anarchism wants to abolish and discredit authority. Socialism, on the contrary, exalts it. This is a difference as radical as that between the North and the South pole; and to confound the two systems, as is constantly being done, is positively disastrous. This is the principal reason why the new term “Nationalism,” even if not absolutely adequate, should be welcomed by American Socialists. Since Anarchists, as a matter of fact, do not get rid of obedience, they cannot logically get rid of authority—“even Anarchy must have a centre,” as Carlyle, with a really profound apprehension of human nature, said. All co-operation needs a representative organ; if not so concentrated, it is sterile. Hence society without government is impossible.

The question is not, whether we shall, or shall not, have authority, but whether it is a sham or a true authority. The only true authority, at bottom, is the order of the world, the Universal Order, and every other authority must agree with it. Every social authority, furthermore, is constituted by a corresponding assent, spontaneous or deliberate, of various individual wills which concur in a common action, and of which it is the organ. This aggregate of individual wills, the effective majority, those who have come to social consciousness, and from whom issues the categorical imperative, constitute the *sovereignty* of a nation. The authority that occupies the seat of this sovereignty is hence derived from concurrence, and in no other way; and the more

extensive the society, the more irresistible the correspondence—such is, even, the authority of the German Kaiser and the Czar of Russia. It is no use to quarrel with this arrangement any more than with the force of gravitation. There is in every nation a seat of sovereignty as surely as in every body there is a centre of gravity, and some person or persons are sure of occupying it. Only when the occupant is in touch with this effective majority, the socially conscious portion of the people, or (what is really the same thing) the trend of social evolution, is it a true authority; otherwise, it is a sham.

Here we meet with the other constituent element of Morality, subordinate, however, to order: Freewill; so that now we can define Morality subjectively as: the *conscious, voluntary* co-operation with the Universal Order, with true authority. Herein is to be found the dignity of man.

Spencer, Stephen, and all Evolution-moralists are really astray, when, in place of the supernatural system, which is supposed to be tottering to its fall, they seek to set up "a new regulative system," which shall restrain the moral conduct of future generations. They are not a bit wiser than Mallock, but like him, they fancy that current morality has its roots in the clouds. We do not need any regulative system from them or anybody else. The forces which produced Morality are ever present to sustain it, and are, age after age, acquiring an increasing power. Morality faces us everywhere with its categorical imperative, while, at the same time, it is coming more and more to surround us with an atmosphere of love.

11. Let us recall our definition of Morality objectively: that it is the "force that binds us together." Now this force consists of a threefold strand: home is our affectional, country our practical, and humanity our intellectual force. All these are requisite to our development; and great as is the misfortune, that continental Socialists want to dispense with the second, with country and patriotism, actually stamping the latter a vice, just so fortunate is it, that the very sound of "Nationalism" consecrates patriotism as an ethical sentiment. It is geographical considerations that

explain and excuse the former, for Socialism is impossible in any one continental country, so long as any others of those countries maintain the old *régime*; therefore the working-classes there clasp hands, ignoring their national characteristics; but the United States is in the unique position of being able to successfully inaugurate Socialism, and thus best serve humanity, by pursuing the even tenor of her history.

One's country, we then say, is *the* practical force, where primarily authority resides. The home and family frequently create an obnoxious bias, arouse a sort of aggregate selfishness, and even become a centre of personal selfishness. Hence it is the office of democracy to put down family pride and exclusiveness, or, by means of country, to raise it one step higher—converting it into collective egoism. Humanity, on the other hand, is too vague to be practical at present, although, by its universality, it is our intellectual force. Love of mankind or aspirations after universal association are yet too weak a sentiment to move any but the choicest spirits. Moreover, the nation seems to be a necessary stage in our evolution toward the highest unity. Let me use an illustration. Suppose we have a vessel and in it a liquid which we want to convert into a solid. One way to accomplish this is to cause it to coagulate gradually and equally throughout the entire mass; another way would be to make the liquid thicken at various points throughout the mass, so that a number of gradually increasing nuclei would be formed which, during this process, would seem to repel, and actually would repel one another; when this absorption was complete the nuclei themselves would attract each other, till we had the one compact solid. Is not this the way in which actually the solidarity of mankind seems to be accomplished? We can apply this illustration to the formation of nations out of classes and provinces (or out of our states), and also of humanity out of nations, which like the above nuclei show a considerable mutual antagonism during the process. But the common destiny, *i.e.*, the organic unity, of Europe was a fact, even when every European nation looked on every other as its natural and permanent enemy.

This intermediate stage is, in our days, nothing narrower than

one's country, the nation. In ancient Greece it was the city. At present it is also with the municipality that the individual is chiefly concerned. It determines the sum of existences proper to each family, since even in our anarchic days the general distribution of labour determines men's respective occupations everywhere. Hence, every one is, in the first place, a *citizen*. But the leaders of the Paris Commune were egregiously in the wrong, positively reactionary, when they insisted on the Commune, the municipality, as the sovereign collectivity. The city has now, historically, expanded into the nation, "the fatherland;" and it is history that settles the matter. The nation it is that has subordinated all individual efforts to a public activity, *carried on by successive generations*, and thereby it has become the symbol to the mind and heart, when our memories of the past, our feelings as to the present, and our wishes for the future seek a centre for common efforts. This centre we express by the word *sovereignty*, and this is the historical acquisition of the nation, and therefore it is the authoritative and practical force. Both history and practical politics unceremoniously disregard the protests of Spencer and the Anarchists. Every nation asserts itself as a power that spends the property and person of the individual without regard to his wishes, and that destroys his life in punishment such as no "Social Contract" can explain by the most palpable fiction. Yet the people do not seem to call in question the morality of such procedure.

Herbert Spencer, further, denies the expediency and rightfulness of the State, alleging that it is no longer needed for the personal security of the individual. This is very shallow indeed, and nothing but prejudice. There will be more said on this important point in another place; here only this: that the State or Government has a function, far more important than that of restraining—which in fact is only temporary—and that is that of regulation, accommodation and amelioration. It is the cohesive force of society, absolutely needed, so long as our self-regarding instincts are more energetic than those that prompt us to union; but afterwards it will be needed to combine and direct and adjust; it is by it that we establish a sense of real solidarity throughout

all generations, and it alone is able to fuse the various industrial classes, which now is so much needed. That is why it is growing in influence.

Till then patriotism will remain the type of the ideal social feeling; but it needs to be transformed into a persistent disposition to perfect our country as a servant of humanity, without concealing her shortcomings. We should be glad that so broad and wide a feeling as that, embracing our country, has the influence that it has. We shall have plenty of use for it, for we are not yet truly a nation, nor, for that matter, is any other people.

American Socialists, or Nationalists, have every reason to foster patriotism, because, as already said, our country needs only to pursue the line of its previous history; we need only point to our Constitution, our Declaration of Independence, and the foundation laid by the Puritans. We probably shall realise Socialism in advance of other nations, and thus be called upon to show them the way; first, because we are a self-sufficing country—in that respect having a great advantage even over Great Britain; next, because we have had most practice in self-government; and lastly, because there really exists good-will between our various classes. Moreover, in spite of our reputation abroad of worshipping the “almighty dollar,” our two great wars have shown that we know how to risk our lives for ideals: that of the Revolution was waged for a point of honour, that of the Rebellion for human liberty and union. Every fibre of ours ought to thrill with patriotism.

12. So far, we have seen that morality is the conscious voluntary co-operation with what has shown itself to be true authority. But all co-operation involves an end, an object. We therefore ask, for what purpose, to accomplish what? Here I state simply the conclusion, leaving the details of the argument for the following chapters.

First, experience, and especially the highest experience, teaches us that if we pursue our individual happiness with conscious and relentless purpose, we surely fail. It teaches us further—and this

is certainly a point of the greatest importance—that the highest development of the individual is evidently *not* what man is designed for. Is it not a fact, which the fearful penalties undergone by so many ought by this time to have knocked into our heads, that one of man's component elements cannot reach the highest development of which it is susceptible except by maltreatment of, and injury or peril to the other? That the mind, especially, which is regarded as the noblest part, can only attain supremacy under bodily conditions which imply or threaten disease? Again, does not the *individual* appear to have reached his perfection centuries ago? It is universally admitted, that for the highest reach and range and power of mental capacity in every line, the lapse of two to three thousand years have shown no sign of increase. Our knowledge, to be sure, has gone on increasing. But very early, I should say, in history the power behind evolution gave to us patterns and types to imitate and approach—not to transcend. Does this not clearly intimate to us our appointed work? ¹

In forbidding us to surpass the limits of the thoroughly but harmoniously developed specimens of humanity, we have assigned to us the feasible—and what ought to be the welcome—task of bringing up the whole human race to these limits. Not to urge the exceptionally few to still more exceptional attainments, not to put our own minds and brains into a hot-bed, not to attempt the surpassing development of our own highest faculties, but to put all our fellow-men into a fertile and wholesome soil, to make all more vigorous, and wise and good, and holy in the measure of their just and well-balanced capacities: this is the perfection we ought to seek after, our true ideal, the end of morals.

This greatly clears our practical course and speculative difficulties. It shows that the timid fugitives from the duties and temptations of the world—whether it be the ascetics of old or the many cultivated moderns, who, having become disgusted with politics and with “the masses,” have gone in for self-cultivation—have all turned their backs on the right goal. It indicates that this is the bottom fact of our existence; that it is the common life of all which each should develop in himself; that one cannot aim

¹ See *Enigmas of Life* by W. R. Greg.

at one's own true well-being without aiming at that of others. These others are not mere means to myself, but are involved in my essence; and this essence is superior to, and gives law to us all in a higher sense than our bodily organism gives law to its members. This makes morality logical in theory and real in fact.

Now we have the complete definition: Morality is the conscious and voluntary co-operation of men *towards the brotherhood and fellowship of man*. When, therefore, men look down upon morality as mere vague sentiment fit only for babies and Sunday schools, we may be sure it is sham morality they have in mind. True morality, on the other hand, must be considered by every earnest and sensible person as the most important thing in life, the main business for us all: indeed, *the prize of life*—the only reality, in truth, worth living and dying for. The more Socialism is studied, the more I am sure it will prove this to be true.

This definition, as the next chapter will show, does not ignore our own selves; we shall there see, that we are equally entitled to define the moral end as self-realisation, if we are careful to consider "self" as a member of the whole. I am morally realised when I am aware of myself as a member, when my private self has ceased to be my exclusive self. By perfecting the world, and thus only, I perfect myself.

Compare now this view with the position of Herbert Spencer: "When the aggregate is no longer in danger from wars, the final object of pursuit, the welfare of the units, no longer needing to be postponed, becomes the immediate object of pursuit." That means, of course, that when, in our days, private and public claims clash, the latter must give way; and that as society progresses, the force that unites its members loosens more and more. This is, surely, as immoral teaching as any can be. What a philosophy of history! And that by the foremost modern English philosopher! What a curious idea he must have of an "organism!" His society has certainly more likeness to a heap of grains of sand than to even the lowest form of organisms. Yet, as Prof. Clifford says: "That society is an organism, the highest of all, is one of those great facts which our own generation has been the first to state rationally."

How much sounder is Sir James Stephen's idea: "The strong metaphor that we are all members one of another is little more than the expression of a fact; a man would be one, outside society, as little as a hand would be a hand without the body."

Since, then, our most popular philosophers inculcate such ideas, it is no wonder that but very few minds gladly postpone their own interests to the public welfare, and as long as this state of things lasts, it is impossible for conscious evolution to take place. But natural evolution goes serenely on. Let us assume that the economic changes, outlined in the previous chapter, have taken place; that the monopolies have become unbearable, so that the nation is forced to announce, that for the future the industries will be carried on by the collectivity—which, by virtue of the authority vested in it, it has a perfect right to do—and we shall witness a radical, a tremendous change in the moral consciousness of the people. They will quickly turn their backs on Spencer and his ideas. They will not need to be told, as children in the schools of France are said now to be taught, that it is to the State they are indebted for their schooling and various other good things. No, immediately after this change, the citizens will have an object lesson daily before their eyes. They will know for certain; they will see that they owe their abundance, their freedom, and their leisure to the Nation. They therefore will know for certain, they will "feel in their bones" that the welfare of the collectivity—whether of the Nation, the State, or the Municipality—means their own welfare; that the general interests are, as a matter of fact, identical with their individual interests. Their country will then, for the first time, become a true "fatherland" to them, and they will naturally cherish for it the feelings which children have for their father, and look up to it as the guardian of their destiny and of their welfare as units.

But what is of by far the greatest importance, is that public opinion will be evolved into a Collective Conscience. The great trouble now is that public opinion is at sea on all great moral questions, and therefore neither speaks nor claims to speak with authority on any. We have a dim sense of a constraining *ought* that, like a life-instinct of the race, always compels man to do

what he does not choose and what he cannot foresee will benefit the individual at all. There is an impulse within us to consider moral ideals as true and not illusory lights, and of binding obligation, to the extent that they must be followed, sometimes at all hazards. Duty must be done at whatever cost, or it is not duty. But then thinkers arise among us like Leslie Stephen, who confine themselves to society as it is, and thus bring in fundamental discord by telling us that there is a "path of duty" and "a path of happiness." For society as it is, almost as a rule, gives success to the cunning, the unscrupulous, the worthless, the impotent, rather than to the worthy. That is to attack these moral ideals in a vital part, to regard moral rules as nothing else than a useful invention to abate social jar and friction; and to bring them down to the level of police regulations is to oppose their binding obligation.

What a wonderful, beneficent change in this respect, when the Social Commonwealth is evolved with its Collective Conscience. It will really make Duty an *obligation*, meaning in Jeremy Taylor's appropriate phrase: something "tied by bands;" for to the Commonwealth it will tie us all by the very strongest bands of interest, of personal well-being, of happiness. It will imperatively, with authority, with a sense of being infallibly right, point out to all the welfare of the aggregate, the solidarity of the social organism, as the end of morals. That is to say, the Collective Conscience will become that "skilful gardener" without whose care no tree can be expected to bear its choicest fruit, the conscious guardian, and trainer of morality. Lastly, it will inaugurate the *conscious* evolution of the race, the Golden Age ahead, when society will consciously second natural evolution.

And as soon as the common destiny of the race becomes a universal article of faith, what a pettiness will be infused into all mere private ends! We have yet to witness the moral superiority of a philosophy which connects each of us with the whole of human existence, in all times and places, inspiring all with an invincible repugnance to moral offences, with an irresistible impulse to steady practical devotedness!

13. Not alone does the Power behind Evolution clearly and distinctly outline the *end* of morals to us, it has already furnished us with a *motive* sufficiently powerful to make us respond almost spontaneously to the promptings of the Collective Conscience. This is Love of Approbation.

Understand, I do not say that there are not even now choice spirits who do not need any ulterior motive at all. They are moral because they like it. "My duties are my rights," they say. But, of course, it is the vast majority of men with whom we are concerned, and they, we know, need a motive and a strong motive. What I contend is, that Love of Approbation is such a motive, of enormous strength, and—I am tempted already here to say, providentially—present in all, even in the choice spirits, who perhaps have acquired their moral spontaneity simply by frequent exercise.

It is trite to say that there are many forms of this faculty. The familiar judgments of companions or contemporaries which fill up everyday life in business, workshop, social intercourse, are all, however slight, so much social pressure on this faculty; but let us instance one example which will show that probably no stronger social force could be born in us.

That is furnished by the duel. Reflect on it! This custom, imposed by military morals, induced knights of the greatest piety to brave the strongest religious condemnation in the most brilliant ages of the Church, thus showing that religious precepts are not nearly so strong as the judgment of one's fellows. This is put into still stronger relief by the notorious fact, that this very duelling is, in our days, spontaneously disappearing under the sway of industrialism.

As this is evidence of its strength, we have an evidence of its universality in the fact that much of the mischief done by our loafers, street-urchins, and criminals, is due to the applause of comrades. It is only love of approbation misdirected.

It may be objected that our choicest spirits, our martyrs, run counter to this faculty, bid defiance to the judgment of their contemporaries and follow their own conscience. But is not the explanation this: that their love of approbation is not less, but it

must, of course, be the approval of those whose judgment they value, and that they do not value the judgment of their contemporaries? May not such men at the same time fancy themselves standing before a court, with God for judge and his saints and all good men of future ages for jury, and fortify themselves with *their* imagined applause?

By the way, a unique instance of the strength of the faculty here suggests itself to me: Suppose a sensitive youth to be in the company of others to whom chastity is a folly, how often has such a one blushed for a chaste action of his own which excites the others' mirth? This blush shows that his virtuous impulses are for the moment overshadowed by his love of approval.

Place now our old human nature, as we know it, no whit changed, subject to the same old motives, under a socialist *régime*. How will this Collective Conscience, evolved by Socialism, act on this love of approbation?

It is unfortunate that health is not infectious as disease is; but most happily, "while vice is as catching as disease, virtue is too." In our present state of anarchy we, of course, see nothing that can give us an idea of the energy and tenacity of this conscience. We cannot fancy to ourselves a plenitude of assent, such as yet never has existed to the same degree: the difference between now and then is the whole gamut between a weakly whispering instinct and a swelled chorus of harmony. Next, we, equally of course, must eliminate all conception of external "force" which has no relation to the feeling of which we now speak. But doing the best we can, we can see that if a divided public opinion can act, as it does, as a great engine for protecting and sanctioning the whole mass of beliefs, habits and customs which collectively constitute current morality, the consciously unanimous Collective Conscience must be able to act as a gigantic magnet of tremendous attracting power. Natural Evolution will thus furnish us, in the socialist *régime* and our old human nature, with a complete self-acting machinery.

All that mass of difficulties which Leslie Stephen, as an individualist, meets with does not at all apply to this new *régime*. Thus he says: Individualist "morality has no leverage. A true

theory of motives will not even tend to make me moral if I care nothing for society." "The search for some reason, binding every man simply as reasonable, is hopeless, unless a man has certain sensibilities, character." That is most true now, but Socialism supplies the *leverage*. At first, indeed, we must expect a few cases of vicious inclinations and entanglement of passion where even such collective conscience will not restrain; for we must not ask too much of change of the generation that brings in the new *régime*. But, to the hardihood of braving the discredit of this conscience, add a socialistic education and training that will keep the young, from infancy till adult age, under the eye of the teacher, and such cases will afterwards be extremely rare. Public disapproval will prove itself far more effective than our present "do it and be damned" theory of morals, not to speak of the deliberate selfishness of this theory.

Spencer's idea that *now* "the moral check to theft is a consciousness of the evils, caused by a disregard of proprietary rights," is another really funny illustration of his manner of looking upon us all as *bourgeois*, "making contracts with each other." But it is impossible to understand how he can think such a check effective in the actual state of mankind, with its motto of "the devil take the hindmost," when lack of wealth is hell and when there is no safety for the unpropertied man. Ah, but in a socialist commonwealth—Spencer's *bête noir* with its community of interests—there it will apply. By the way, we have to-day in Switzerland, which is as complete a nation as any, an interesting instance of the superiority of common interests over even ethnic and religious sympathies as a social bond.

We are now ready to enter upon a consideration of the last of our *data* of Ethics: the change in our intellectual views, the atmosphere to morality; but it is advisable to discuss first two questions that might otherwise prove stumbling-blocks to inquirers. These are Equality and Individuality, which really hang together.

14. The majority cry for equality, the minority for individuality, and both cries are warranted. The former means that men of the same race, with something of an education, will not endure gross

inequality of fortunes. The latter means that nature's inequality of gifts, which furnishes the only superiority of divine right, has been nullified and trampled on by present society's artificial inequality; that the one inequality, founded on fact, has been set aside by another founded on chance or chicane, and favoured by existing institutions. The socialist commonwealth will realise both this rational equality and this rational inequality or individuality—at bottom one and the same thing, and its citizens will recognise real inequalities where they exist, as much as substantial equality where it exists.

It will, I apprehend, realise equality in three different forms :

Equal rights to the inheritance of mankind: that is to say, we shall be equal partakers of the commonwealth and its well-being; note, I say *partakers*, for it is in consumption where Equality appears, as Individuality does in production.

We claim an equal right to this "inheritance of mankind" which, by our institutions, a minority is at present enabled to monopolise, and which it does monopolise and use in order to extort thereby an unearned increment; and this inheritance is true *Capital*. We mean thereby the principle, potentiality, embodied in the axe, the spade, the plough, the steam-engine, tools of all kinds, books or pictures, bequeathed by thinkers, writers, inventors, discoverers, and other labourers of the past, a social growth to which all individual claims have lapsed by death, but from the advantages of which the masses are virtually shut out, for lack of means. The very best definition of government, even that of to-day, is that it is the agency of society which procures title to this treasure, stores it up, guards and gives access to it to every one, and of which all must make the best use, first and foremost by education. Not the least mischief is the terrible waste that we make of it.

The socialist republic will realise this equality by giving to all an equal opportunity to earn all they need and want. This is a very different thing from the suggestion that all citizens should receive *equal* remuneration. I do not believe in the latter; it seems curious to me that they who suggest it cannot see that this would be highly unjust, since men have very different needs and wants. Communism is far more just, since it would give to

ling to his needs, but this is altogether too
ty could not stand such generosity.

a higher form of equality: social rather than
s to say, *all citizens will be independent of each*
ually dependent on the commonwealth. It was
quality that the cry burst out in the eighteenth
er a barren phrase, an abstraction of jurists and
t a fiery, living force, taking possession of the
It has sunk deep into the soul of our century and
the master spirits of the age.

ady seen that the most invidious powers of the
es now are these two: that the giving or the
employment is a matter of arbitrary favour and
he right to arbitrarily discharge their employees.
o immense gains: security during good behaviour
all to demand suitable—not a particular—employ-
l. That disposes of the objection that we shall
it on political bosses. There will be no spoils,
inding parties, or rather factions, hence no

classical land of equality. At the Polytechnic
, the pupils are unaware of the bursars' names,
wn only to a committee, pledged by honour to
s the delicacy of the spirit of equality. This is the
ng-block of Socialism in England. Dr. Arnold ob-
t that there, "well-dressed men and women converse
persons of the lowest rank," as something that
ve know how servile "tuft-hunters" at Oxford are
e" fellow-students, and that a physician who has
is hand for guineas cannot possibly hope to take a
ers of the realm; that, as is said, "talents lose
cent. in value on reaching England." But—a
en for us!—we are still better off here than in
re not yet, and it is to be hoped will never be,
hese two sorry classes, as everywhere in Europe:
a decent clothes, who are expected to give tips on
nd the balance who expect to get tips.

But the most important, as well as by far the most practicable form of equality, undoubtedly, is the last, that of *the co-ordination of equal corporate bodies*. It is impossible that there can be equality between all individuals in their productive capacity, and yet this is the equality that is most prized and most valuable. It can, however, be secured by having all useful citizens gathered into trades-unions—for lack of a better term—all, however, distinctly unlike, ranking as equals, on account of the equally essential services which each renders, and these, perhaps, consolidated into “estates of the realm.” The confidence enjoyed by the most eminent thinker, since no one can know or judge of everything, is analogous to that which in a measure he in turn accords to the humblest intelligence on subjects best understood by the latter. This “in a measure” drops away when we come to corporate bodies. There is a public utility in the humblest offices of public bodies, not a whit less truly than in the loftiest functions of government, and whatever difference in dignity may exist, as some might fancy, is more than made up by the preponderance of numbers necessarily to be found in the former. Every citizen’s dignity and equality is then secured by his membership in one of these bodies.

With the attainment of rational equality we can at last frankly deny the so-called “rights of man” in theory, as we must do if society is ever to be the arbiter of its own destiny, and as the “rights” have practically always been denied. They have only made it easier for unscrupulousness to accomplish its personal aggrandisement. Social duties take the place of personal rights. I may choose my own station, but its duties do not depend upon my liking, or upon that of any other person; they are the appurtenances of the station, and “these duties are my rights.” We may yet come back to the medieval ideal of the “freedom” of the various functions.

It is noteworthy, as showing the trend of individual minds, that not alone has Mallock broached this idea of “estates of the realm;” but Felix Adler has suggested that, instead of having our legislatures and boards of aldermen elected as at present, they should be composed of representatives of the various business, working,

and farming classes; each group to decide with authority on all matters, especially concerning their own interests.

Equality is thus by no means anything like monotony of external conditions, but simply harmony, cessation of conflict, the sign of health. The fact that a single healthy human body exists is a warrant for a future healthy human society. Man will surely enter the gate that the flaming sword so long has guarded, and when the socialist commonwealth is fully evolved, it is *equality* that will establish the Kingdom of Heaven on earth.

15. The weightiest objection of educated minds to Socialism seems to be what one of our foremost novelists once expressed to the present writer in these words: "I might accept your Socialism, if the fear did not haunt me that your collective authority would crush out all individuality."

This, if valid, would surely in my eyes be an insuperable objection. While I detest individualism, I hold *Individuality*—that is, the sum of all the qualities which differentiate me from others—most sacred. It is not what entitles us to the divine regard, but it is that *which enables us to serve our country and humanity*, and to wipe it out would, indeed, be a calamity, greater even to society than to ourselves. Equality in enjoyment as I have defined it, is a most sacred thing, but equality in production would be deplorable—actually deplorable.

Individuality—in which is included ability, talents, genius—will, indeed, be needed much more by the socialist commonwealth than by the present social order. In all co-operative production a single brain must be the responsible head which governs and guides those who perform the mechanical processes and manual dexterities. And so Socialism, while it has no use for Mallock's "ability" to watch the market, will need intelligence to control, over a much larger field, the whole course of labour from start to finish, and appoint to each worker his suitable part in the division of labour.

Yes, Socialism will give to nature's inequality its heaven-born right: high place, not high pay. This is the question of modern democracy: how to find and utilise nature's aristocracy, always

existing, and of it form a hierarchy, according to capacity in each generation, ignoring all other claims as illegitimate. A sound stable democracy must run on lines opposed to a dead-level communism.

To do this, individuality must have a basis and a stimulus. Socialism furnishes both, thus doing entirely away with the objection.

The basis we have already shown: Independence and Leisure, principally the former, which in itself is the very essence of individuality. If a class of men have an independent living, their individualities are almost sure to assert themselves, even if other conditions are not particularly favourable. But if not, then, alas! then individuality is their curse. For that reason, what high spirits are now crushed, poisoned and perverted? What heaven-sent capacity now repressed and frozen that should have rejoiced the world! What progress in science, arts, inventions, letters and thoughts we might have had!

And now as to the other condition of individuality: incentives? Can any one who seriously reflects on what has been said, doubt that Socialism will far surpass the present order in furnishing these? Ah, some will quote from what has been said above: "no high pay." Yes, that is the saddest part of our age, that money rewards have come to be the chief and only incentive. But then it was not always so. Phidias and Michael Angelo surely never thought of money; the golden calf has been made our god only by this Satanic individualism. When this is overthrown, the old incentives will regain their ascendancy over noble minds: the joys of creative genius, social distinction, and the honour of directing affairs—and these the socialist commonwealth will furnish on a scale never before known; besides this, I am sure that the gifted will have all the material enjoyments they will care for. Yes, ability will be exalted to a degree hitherto unheard of! In particular, Socialism will take care that the *élite* of the children of the people gain access to the highest prizes, therein imitating the Church of the Middle Ages, which searched for and fostered talent in the poor, with the result that genius of the highest order commonly sprang from the people, in spite of the weight on its wings.

But what the objectors especially have in mind is an idea that the central authority will control every action of every member. This is nothing but an absurd misapprehension, which should be already cleared up by what has been said above on the co-ordination of the corporate bodies, and which will become still more evident in the following chapter. Only this much here, that there will at the *very utmost* be as much "authority" as now, only, private control will have changed into public control. A word as to the term "authority" applied to individuality. Is it not a fact that authority, in the sense of restraint, is frequently *blessed*, is indeed the very first condition for the development of individuality?

The following quotation from Fiske is even more applicable to our typical self-made employer, and the typical socialist administrator, respectively, than to those of whom he speaks: "The primitive type is the man with an enormous sense of his own importance, easily roused to paroxysms of anger, brooking no contradictions, domineering over all within his reach. The modern man is the type of mild personality, shunning the appearance of self-assertion, slow to anger, patient of contradiction, unwilling to make trouble."

In all respects, I think, our favoured country surpasses all nations in the conditions for successfully inaugurating Socialism—except one. We have one weak spot: our coloured population. They *must* attain to social equality. Socialism cannot exist with a class of helots. Much patient toil is required on both sides to attain to that equality. It seems worth while to suggest to the most elevated and educated of the coloured race, that they can do much to that end, perhaps far more than all the rest of the race. If they, or but a few of them, will furnish to the world instances of great intellectual and moral worth, a very great step will have been taken toward a change of sentiment toward the whole race. It is impossible to say how much the coloured people owe simply to the fact that a Douglass or a Bruce have issued from them. But if, instead of cultivating politics, they will try to find out if there is among them a literary or scientific genius, or if—what is open to them all—they should in a future epidemic, say, of yellow

fever, manifest the spirit of self-sacrifice, the whole race will be sensibly lifted up. Such is the power of individuality.

Sir James Stephen, in his book, *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity*, gives vent to this observation: "It is a question whether the rapid production of an immense multitude of common-place, self-satisfied and essentially slight people in America is an exploit which the whole world need fall down and worship." This is the judgment of a superficial observer. It is in our generation becoming clearer and clearer, that the opposite characteristic is fast taking possession of the hearts and minds of the American people, of both the toiling masses and the leaders of conscience, that is to say, that "the bond that binds us together" is becoming remarkably strengthened, and that consciousness of this fact will soon distinguish us among the peoples of the earth.

CHAPTER III.

CONTRADICTIONS.

"I see no reason why progress in the moral world should be so slow, or the return for moral efforts so pitifully small. If the Church would address her efforts, not in persuading men to adopt a certain set of opinions, but to adopt certain habits of life, she would find the work of conversion easy and rapid."—*W. H. H. Murray.*

16. I quote the above words not in approval but as a warning. As we shall see in other chapters, and have already partly seen, there is ample reason why "progress in the moral world is so slow." What, however, we are here concerned with is the assumption that habits of life are independent of, and can be divorced from opinions. This is a great, a very grave blunder. That *our Free-will may properly co-operate with the Universal Order*, it is, precisely, imperatively necessary that it be governed, moved by correct opinions, by right reason.

When a gardener takes charge of a young plant, the first thing he considers is the atmospheric conditions which its nature demands; whether it can stand the open air or must be placed inside a hot-house, whether it does or does not crave sunshine; we may even imagine plants that thrive by getting sunshine through a red or a blue glass. Our intellect acts as the atmospheric medium to morality. True, no development of intellect makes a man moral. Morality has to do with appetites, passions, *feelings*, but it makes all the difference in the world, whether the facts of our environment act on our feelings through an intellect that interprets them correctly or falsely. Many a warm-hearted man has had his benevolence stifled by looking on misery through Malthusian spectacles—being confused by the sophistries of Malthus.

Man has not yet, as Huxley says, "discovered his true place in

Nature." A philosopher from a higher planet, if he saw our present predicament, would laugh at our awkwardness if he did not think our situation too tragical. It is well known that what we really see is not, say, a house, but the small reversed picture of the house drawn on the retina of the eye; but every child learns instinctively in infancy to follow the rays of the picture to their true source; and then to grasp mentally this source, the house itself in its true position and dimensions.

The same thing has happened to us in all our relations to the physical world; experience has everywhere had to come to our aid. The apparent, when no acquired *data* existed for directing our judgment, has differed widely from, and often been the direct opposite of, the real. The deliverance of sight, we saw, would be inverted, but for an experience which we simply do not remember. But the more remote and obscure the relations of the known to the unknown, the more instruction do we require. Thus no one of us would ever think of accounting for the revolution of our earth, were we not taught the true explanation. And so with the paradox of the earth's support and its shape. The appearance is, that it is supported and that it is flat; that the reality is the very reverse we learn from scientific experience.

Now we are in a similar predicament as to our social surroundings; and we are, unfortunately, confirmed in it by the fact that we are living in a transition period from one organic order to another, which fact veils to us the real state of affairs; and this predicament is precisely analogous to the one our forefathers were in under the Ptolemaic system, when the appearance was, and when they believed, that the earth was the centre of the solar system. For our intellect likewise turns our relation to society upside down, makes us fully believe the reverse of the reality. Here as elsewhere things are not what they appear to be, but are very frequently precisely what they seem *not* to be.

It is natural evolution that again here will come to our assistance; it will give us a correct conception of our environment, reverse the picture for us in our mind; and how? By leading us in our progress to a socialist *régime* into such glaring contradictions that we shall have no peace of mind before we rectify our

conception, and bring ourselves into true relations with the facts of our environment. It is the various false conceptions we now cherish, and the contradictions, or logical absurdities, into which they lead us that will occupy us in this chapter.

Herbert Spencer and his school furnish us with the clearest exposition of the general form of these false conceptions, of this reversed picture. "The State is now regarded as existing only for the sake of the individual." In other words, the individual is the centre of the social system, and the State, Society, and every higher unity, is secondary. Prof. Sumner's book, "What Social Classes Owe to Each Other," is from beginning to end an essay on social isolation, inculcating that the only relation between individuals is a cash account; in other words, it is an ingenious attempt to adjust the universe to a perspective, obtained by standing on one's head. There is in the essay one sentence that might stand for its motto: "The State is to me only the All-of-us," the intellectual fallacy of which will be evident to everybody, the moment we utter simply one word: posterity. Whatever else the State is for, it is clear that its function extends to caring for posterity, a function which no individual can perform. At this stage we surely must see, that Prof. Sumner is not nearly so profound a philosopher as Pascal, who defined the State as the social unit, composed of our ancestors, us the living, and our posterity.

We pass now to the special consideration of these false conceptions, each worse than the preceding; and shall see how the contradictions into which they lead us will make us reverse them.

17. The first false conception of our social relations can be expressed by the saying: "The State least governed is best governed." But it is important that the reader at the start should know wherein I affirm the falsity lies. It is not that I insist that the State most governed is best governed. I affirm that they are blind to a *fact*—that we are now at least as much governed as in the past, and shall be forever. A society cannot exist without government, and the more developed society is, the more of government must we have. Now, government is either by private individuals or by public authority; here it is that "more" or

"less" comes in, and what is said in the above phrase by those who think "government" abominable, is really, that a million private authorities are better than one public authority. Thus interpreted into correct language most of them will probably repudiate it.

We know very well by this time how this false conception originated—that it is a historical growth. First, there was the feudal society, rich, flexible, varied, thoroughly harmonious, a compact coherent society, perfectly realising the essential condition of an organism: concurrence to a common end; but "its head of gold kept out of sight, like awkward feet of clay, its humble industrial basis." By-and-bye the feet of clay protruded more and more, while the head of gold retreated; of the feet certain individuals attained prominence, made themselves in time private masters and became at last jealous of the head, the central authority. They created such a public sentiment that their followers exulted in the degradation of that central authority, the "tyrant," and called this "liberty," forgetful of the chains their private masters had put upon them.

The consequences—the contradictions—have meanwhile developed themselves. It is as if these private masters had stumbled into power like a Caliban, had become blindly possessed of the secrets of Prospero, and did not know how to use them. At a distance of six centuries industrialism is still destitute of a logical and coherent ideal, and has so far developed without any guidance or guardianship at all, of which, however, it now more and more feels its need. For it has resulted in a miserable mal-adjustment everywhere. The feet become more and more conscious that they stand in need of the central authority—and perhaps it is not such a terrible "tyrant" after all.

Indeed, everyone now feels that there is a most pernicious mal-distribution of energies, due mainly to the fact that no practical systematic attempt has yet been made to estimate the real needs of the social organism and to distribute its forces in accordance therewith. As has been well said, "the theoretical estimate has been made by many sets of people, according to many principles; the practical direction is continued by others, in accordance with customs, habits, traditions, convenience, sentimentalism, prejudice,

fashion—everything except the principles of organic adjustment, alone serviceable.”¹

And look at the miserable mal-adjustment which is caused by this mal-distribution. On one hand, millions crushed down by their burden of constant toil that ends only with death; on the other, thousands whose forces waste in enforced idleness. Here men and women whose hair have become prematurely grey from nervous strain, and with skin prematurely wrinkled from bodily exertion, and there men and women, weary from *ennui*, because they have nothing to do. Here minds strained by too heavy responsibilities, and there minds cruelly cramped by far too narrow duties. Energies that vainly seek employment and work that much needs to be done, and yet it is left undone, because there is no one to do it. On the one hand mankind *slaving* like working bees and yet *starving* in the midst of the riches they have created, on the other unwieldy, fat drones, unable to enjoy. What a waste of power, all due to the impotence of the central authority! For people come now more and more to see that this authority need not be a tyrant at all, but is precisely what they make it. That its proper name is not so much “government” at all, with the function of restraining, but rather *administration*, since what they need is a guide, a director, a regulator.

Because of the impotence of this authority, the regular evolution of life is now so often thwarted, its hopes disappointed, its character degraded. How many of our youths dream ambitious dreams of what they will do and achieve as men, and when they have reached forty years, are exceedingly happy if they become sure of a decent living, by uninterrupted drudgery, for the rest of their life. How many parents now pinch themselves, in order to enable their children to pass through our grammar schools, our high schools and our universities, who, when they are fitted to be servants of society, are abandoned by the State, which, as it cannot utilise their attainments, leaves them positively worse off than before their education—their culture become their curse. Think of the multitude of criminals; the worst of these were once innocent children as we all were; it was thoroughly known that the very

¹ *The Value of Life*—anonymous.

atmosphere they breathed was saturated with filth and vice, and that it would be a miracle if they did not grow up into vicious men; yet the State left them—had to leave them—in their vice till it was compelled to grasp them with its iron hand and thrust them into the penitentiaries.

Only a very few words are here needed to illustrate the further point, that our private masters are not merely poor substitutes for a public authority, but that self-interest leads them to enrich themselves at the expense of the community, turns them into scoundrels who manipulate demand and supply, and under the cover of law gamble in the necessities of life, something which the feudal society made a heinous crime, as indeed it is. Gambling is the very antithesis of society. Oil and corn and pork, all the great staples of the country, the stocks of our great railroads, and steamship and manufacturing companies and mines, are all monopolised by gamblers who wear the mask of business, unsettling values and paralysing society's productive agencies. And it is too well known, though too little reflected on, that our employers, finding it to their interests under the present system to have always a reserve army of needy operatives at hand, have been for years instrumental in bringing hosts of foreign labourers into the country, and thus positively been the creators of our pauperism.

18. This false conception of government has been mentioned first, because, however mischievous, it is yet the least mischievous of all, and, again, because it is the first to be undergoing rectification in our days. The reversed conception is what I call *true democracy*.

It is a trite saying, that the civilised world is persistently and with accelerating steps marching towards democracy. But what is meant by that term, and where shall we find its embodiment? That our country is as yet a pure democracy is, of course, arrant nonsense. A fable says, that once upon a time a farmer called his fowls together, to consult with them. Seating himself in the chair, he said: "The question for discussion is with what sauce will you be eaten?" After a pause an old rooster at the edge of the crowd gave vent to the general sentiment by the remark:

"But, Mr. Chairman, we do not want to be eaten." "The remark is entirely irrelevant; please confine yourselves to the question," was the response. The moral of which is, that a democracy, *i.e.* political freedom, is out of the question as long as economic freedom does not prevail. And yet a democracy does not mean a State where public authority is exercised by the counting of heads. This is not simply to oppose one opinion to another, but to call attention to a *fact*: that we have in our midst bodies where the democracy of the future is being exemplified before our very eyes, to wit: trade-unions.

A century or so ago, all social classes were everywhere pronounced theoretically equal and free. That is to say, labour was to be considered a ware, on equal footing with other commodities, and the workers were to be equally free to dispose of their ware as merchants were of theirs. But it was soon seen, and especially felt by the working-men, that this was a very illusory equality indeed. The theory that then began to be believed by everybody, that the individual was the centre, and that self-interest was the highest law, was first perceived by them to be a fallacy, not at all because they were wiser or more intelligent than others, but because they were the first to feel the pinch of the contradiction. They perceived that the man whose "ware" was inseparable from himself, and who, therefore, could not sell it without selling himself body and soul, was on a very different footing from sellers of other wares, and that the only way of effecting some real equality was to renounce the theory of the autonomy of the individual—and thus our modern trades-unions were formed.*

Of course it soon became clear to others who did not yet feel the pinch, that the policy which the unions pursued was often distinct from, and sometimes the reverse of, the line of conduct which the self-interest of any individual member would have led him to follow. Economists agreed that each one would accept work at a low rate rather than insist on a general rise by striking. • But precisely this the unions did accomplish, and they put an effective pressure on employers. Then the unions were pronounced "tyrannical bodies which enforced a blind obedience from their miserable members," and economists posed as defenders of the

"liberty" of the individual citizen, and called the leaders unscrupulous, deluding agitators. Time reversed this judgment also. More and more has public opinion had its eyes opened and come round to the side of the unionists, till at last it has decided against those who taught that "we must not interfere with a man in driving his own bargain;" it has come to see that "freedom of contract" is an illusion in cases where there are children or even adults on one side and rich employers on the other.

The leaders of organised working-men have the satisfaction of knowing that they were far more clear-seeing in their way than our greatest philosophers, and that this will eventually be admitted by all.

These unions and all organisations of labour proceed on these two principles: first, that direction of social affairs belongs to the capable; and, secondly, that all citizens must participate in that direction by their intelligent co-operation. Each of these principles by itself is but a half-truth, and like all half-truths, highly dangerous; but united they voice a splendid truth and precisely define true democracy—the democracy which, without a doubt, is destined to be adopted by all civilised nations. The unions repudiate the fallacy that "the society least governed is best governed." They know that some members are wiser than others; they critically and thoughtfully sift out their natural leaders and guides; and, having found them, thrust their whole collective power into their hands to be retained as long as they prove true, and so to say grapple them to their hearts with links of steel, following them "as captains whom they trust." But mark this: "as long as they prove true," for *strict responsibility* is the very essence of the system.

Now we may be sure, that even long before Socialism is inaugurated, the majority of our people will have become convinced that the more complex society is, the more is administration needed; and that the necessity for social adjustment imperatively requires that the administration be confined to the hands of the collectivity. The socialist republic, then, will most likely copy the model which the trade-unions have worked out; it will cause the administrators to be elected from *below*, that is to say, will

make the ordinary workmen select their own foremen, these foremen elect their superintendents, and so on to the chief of departments. Perhaps it will improve on the model by placing the dismissal of these officers in the hands, not of the electors, but of their immediate superiors. In other words, it will enforce responsibility by means of the *veto* of the superiors.¹ The directing class will thereby be sure of possessing the good-will of inferiors, equals, and superiors. It will, moreover, exalt ability and answer the question: How shall we secure our Able Men? It will put the round men into round holes and square men into square holes, and everyone will be aware of the fact.

19. We now come to the second false conception, one worse than the first, blindness to another fact. If you explain Socialism to the average business man, and come to its essence, that it proposes to make him a public functionary, he gets indignant at the very idea. Yet the fact is, he is and has always been a public functionary, but has not been aware of the fact. A druggist will not for a moment doubt that his business is entirely a private affair of his own, that he can say, carelessly: "Ah, we are out of this thing just now," that he can open and close his store at any time he pleases, unmindful of the convenience and the necessities of his customers; while, in sober truth, he keeps his store because society, or a section of it, has a use for it. In spite of all his protests, he is performing a social function, and therefore it is his bounden duty to perform it properly. He may choose his function, but the duties of it are not of his choosing.* As with this, so precisely with all other occupations, without exception: with butchers, bakers, tailors, they are what and where they are, only because society, or some of its parts, requires them to perform those duties in that place; if they are not wanted they soon get notice to leave.

There are some cases of which I cannot help mentioning one, which shows very curiously how little business men are affected by the *fact* that they are public servants, and especially how little this fact is as yet appreciated by the general public: this is the

* For details see *The Co-operative Commonwealth*.

case of transportation companies, that admittedly are *quasi*-public servants. As is well known, the *Old Colony R. R. Co.* transports passengers between Boston and New York, partly by boat. Most of my readers may also know, that in the summer—when, of course, by reason of the heavy travel, the cost of the service must be considerably less than during the remainder of the year—the fare is actually \$1 more than in winter months. Thus, instead of serving the public, instead of transporting them as safely and cheaply as possible, which is evidently the reason of its existence, this *quasi*-public corporation (very “quasi” indeed) seems to think its function is to fleece the public. If there were a healthy, a *conscious* Public Opinion, this company would very soon be put into the pillory for such an outrage.

This has already led us into the expected contradiction, *i.e.*, logical absurdity. Whole classes of our population have felt the pinch of this assumption, and have for some time stood open-mouthed, wondering what it was that pinched, and only of late have some been bold enough to speak out. This contradiction is couched in the well-known phrase: “Have I not a right to do what I please with my own?” My own what? Not the function—that, as we saw, has been entirely overlooked—but the mere incidental of the function: the profits. On these the stress has been laid to such an extent, that our largest industries are now “owned” by men who have nothing at all to do and know nothing whatever of the function. These “owners” are shareholders and bondholders, who live ignorant of the nature even of their possessions, and leave managers to screw down their workmen, satisfied so long as they receive the dividends. Nothing is therefore more common, even with large concerns, when receipts fall off, than to recoup the loss out of wages rather than to economise on dividends. One day a hundred porters and signal-men were discharged from a large railroad, in order to effect a saving of 325,000 dols. a year in expenses. These industrious men and their families were turned into the street, rather than deduct *five cents* in dividends on every 500 dol. share. No wonder it set folks to thinking so that some of them blurted out: “But this railroad is not *your own*. We are your business partners.” They

had really nearly touched the right spot. If they had gone a little deeper down they would have seen that it is the function that is material, and that it is social. They would then have further seen that the case is really stronger than they had put it, that the persons who only pocket the profits and have no share in the function, are interlopers in the concern; that those who do the business are really the exclusive business-partners. When society becomes conscious of this *fact*, it will say to the present "owners": "Have you any human relation to your 'property' at all? Do you come together at your meetings to consider how best to administer it for the public good, how to turn out the most useful and genuine articles, how to compass the welfare of the men engaged in it? If not, you are doing nothing or worse than nothing with it—you are using your legal powers to aggrandise yourselves at the cost of others, you are preventing others from using them better, you are by just so much strangling the life of the people. Begone!"¹

Behold the picture reversed! In the co-operative commonwealth all will be public functionaries, and all our labours, past and present, will be looked upon as *public functions*. Instead of considering "profits" as the more important, and function secondary, we shall place function first, and make remuneration incidental, in accordance with the *facts*.

A far-reaching reversal of our social valuations will follow this change in our point of view. Every candid man will frankly admit that there is at present a stigma, a social ostracism attached to manual labour, or when regarded as honourable it is yet looked upon as a hardship. This is not at all because of the disagreeable nature of the work; we all know that, without losing caste, a physician performs, as a matter of course, the nastiest, coarsest, and most malodorous duties, akin to scavengering. Why is it then? Because all manual work and disagreeable, nasty occupations, as such, are now hampered by the consciousness of being performed only for a *living's sake*; hence they are left to the poorest classes of people, and hence, again, they are so badly paid. We may all know, if we will but do a little thinking, that the reason why the

¹ See Ed. Carpenter's *England's Ideal*.

professions are especially honoured is, that they have a *quasi*-public character, and are not done or are not supposed to be done altogether for pay.

This depreciation of labour has been most deplorable, and has vitiated all our social relations. But now suppose all labours become acknowledged public functions! Is it not clear that a function which in any way furthers the welfare of the social organism will become just as respectable as any other—that, in other words, all useful labours, as such, *will be equally honoured*? Surely the function of a coal-heaver will bring him as truly into relation with the social organism as that of the chief of the State, since coal-heaving is quite as necessary as are his functions. I have no hesitation in predicting that the nasty labours, when they cease to be done for a living, but on the contrary are performed in a sacrificing spirit, will be honoured accordingly.

Of course the remuneration is now the very first consideration, most frequently the sole one. It cannot possibly be otherwise, so long as social arrangements compel us to place self-interest first. But is it not just as easy to understand, that for the same reasons, when a living has become the secured provision which society makes for us to enable us to carry on our functions, remuneration will retire into the background?

What a wonderful influence this change will have on the training of our youths! Our common schools necessarily minister to our regard for “business” and speculation and our depreciation of manual labour. The agitation for manual training in our schools is, of course, an excellent one, but so long as this industrial system lasts, it can only result, at the utmost, merely in making skilled workmen out of the children of our working classes. When, on the other hand, all social functions are on an equal footing, manual training will show its splendid effects on *all* our children. For it is a branch of instruction in which all young folks, of both sexes, take an interest; in the schools of Paris, experience shows that the pupils begrudge the time they cannot spend in the workshops, and frequently pass hours out of school-time over their iron and wood work. Manual training is destined to incite to voluntary activity thousands upon thousands of children

that otherwise would be accounted dull and stupid, and will be the principal means of enabling them and their teachers to find out and choose the careers for which they are really fitted. But, as we shall now see, that career will not then be what it now generally is : will not have for its object to get the better of one's fellow-men.

20. At length we have reached the third false conception, and, indeed, by far the worst. For this is not simply blindness to a fact, but it is the enthronement of a *lie* ! I mean the *struggle for life*, which Herbert Spencer glorifies as "the most universal, the most controlling and comprehensive generalisation." Granted, that it applies to the animal world and savages, it does not apply—was never intended to apply—to civilised men ; but here it is replaced by its very opposite (the fact to which they are blind) : that we are evidently intended to work in harmony, in order to *struggle against nature*. This struggle for existence is in theory what competition is in practice—indeed, it would be a great gain for correct reasoning, if we could always substitute the former for the latter, since, when Socialists speak of destroying competition, their opponents like to insinuate, that at the same time they will do away with whatever of emulation there is in competition. Only such confusion of terms can account for the fact, that political economists speak of competition as being "what gravitation is in the mechanism of the heavens." Let it, then, be clearly understood, that when we want to destroy competition, it is this *struggle for life*, for existence, we want to abolish forever, while we desire to foster *emulation*. We say that labour, still under bondage to competition—simply because its rational sight is not yet recovered—is tragical ; that restless men making war upon each other with convulsive energy, as if driven by galvanism, tearing asunder mountains, is a sad spectacle ! This theory of a struggle for life is satanic, is anti-social and in the highest degree wasteful. These are some of the contradictions into which it leads us.

It is satanic, nothing less than *atheistic*. If you once allow that the struggle for existence is the all-pervading law, even

throughout humanity, you will have to admit the pitiless logic of Haeckel, that "only the idealist scholar who closes his eye to the real truth can any longer tell the fable of the moral ordering of the world." But then we also must admit, that there was a good deal of truth in Robespierre's saying that "atheism is aristocratic; from refusing to admit a controlling order on earth it is but a step to denying order in heaven," for none but "aristocrats," comfortable people, can rest satisfied with the doctrine, that selfishness is beneficent in human activity. It deprives virtue of all reality beyond convention. It is a doctrine of the pit, and has been bringing hell to earth in large instalments for a good many years. And the human heart feels—even before its intellectual sight is recovered—that the relation which systematically allows the unsuccessful to go to the wall is not human. The right to take advantage of another's misfortunes no longer satisfies us. What a change in our conception of life in that respect has occurred since political economy was in its zenith, thirty years ago: when capitalists consciously and greedily sacrificed the national welfare to the accumulation of "national" wealth, and some even deplored high wages as a calamity! Then there was a bowing of knees to Baal, to Mammon! Now we have at last set our faces resolutely the other way; and many scorn to claim anything, not duly earned, and feel themselves not degraded by doing work useful to society, however menial.

Of course the struggle for existence is *anti-social*. Its very definition is to advance oneself *at the cost of others*, to elbow others aside. When one comes to feel it, it degrades and warps whatever is human within one. It is a dark, bitter, desolating civil war, more cruel and keen than that decided by bullets from a barricade, when all the furniture is pawned and sold, when famine and misery besiege the home—a war in which they fight over wealth, produced by joint exertions. And the worst is that it destroys the moral wealth of the nation faster than its material wealth; it tends to make men bitter, suspicious, and cruel; it turns neighbour against neighbour.

This alone shows that competition is terribly *wasteful*. It does not produce or help to produce anything. But when a piece of

wise work—according to Ruskin “so much sustenance”—has been produced, then some one comes along and “cozens” the producer out of it. We have had a striking example in the West Shore R. R., built in order to share the fleecings of the Hudson River R. R. If a thorough analysis could be made, it would be found what immense losses have been sustained by the people of this country from competition between railroads and telegraph companies; and these are small compared with what they will be in the immediate future, when competition sets in for division of profits in localities (in the West) where ample facilities now exist. What a loss to the community where rival companies earn dividends! Two or more offices in each town where one is ample; two distinct staffs of officers, operators and line men to be maintained, and repairs on two separate, parallel lines. But people’s eyes will soon be opened, especially since the prophecy which Socialists made long ago, that competition necessarily results in monopoly, is fast being fully felt along the whole line. Competition, struggle for life, is a standing contradiction. The Co-operative Commonwealth will be the true embodiment of *emulation*—the very reverse of the struggle for existence; it is the generous desire to see who can best serve the community: this is the source of all that is great in human endeavour and of all that is excellent in human achievement. Men can never dispense with it, and the best communities will never be without it.

Here Mallock steps in and weaves a remarkable web of sophisms, tending to prove that the working masses and emulation are perfect strangers. He says in his *Social Equality*: “But for the wealthy classes wealth would never be produced by labour.” “Inequality, so far from being an accidental evil of civilisation, is the efficient cause of its development and of its present maintenance.” “If wealth did not exist for the wealthy, it would not exist at all. If they were not pleased with fine ceilings, fine gilding, harmoniously coloured walls, we should not have them. To hold it up to him as a prize to which, as a labourer, he has any right to, or which, as a labourer, he could ever possibly possess, is simply to delude him.”

Please note, that this is a very different function of wealth from

that discussed in a previous chapter. There Mallock claimed that the wealthy classes furnished the "ability" needed for the *production* of wealth; here he insists, that if these classes did not graciously consent to consume wealth, it would not be *consumed*, and hence not produced, for the labouring classes have no desire for anything but the mere necessities of life. In other words, civilisation can be kept up to its present level only on the condition that we maintain our present plutocracy.

But was it then the rich that brought Athens to its artistic and intellectual height, or was it the body of its citizens? Was it the rich during the Middle Ages that produced a Raphael and a Michael Angelo? It is evident that, however well Mallock may be familiar with the aristocracy of his country, he knows nothing of the *elite* of the working men of Great Britain, and still less, if that be possible, of the organised wage earners of America.

No student can fail to notice the remarkable change that the last century has created in the Anglo-Saxon working-classes: it is the simple truth to say, that it has made them the intellectual and moral leaders of progress. Let it be admitted, that theretofore our labourers could not be led to work by anything but hunger, and that they did not care for anything but the satisfaction of their coarsest necessities. All this is radically changed, their whole character is altered. The desires at first implanted into them with difficulty have now taken root, and having so long been schooled in producing wealth for others, they are now in a condition to desire it and to produce it for themselves.

But contemplate them in the co-operative commonwealth. All the trades of the country will then centre in trades-unions, extending from ocean to ocean: our whole land will be dotted over with small towns, each the centre of a special industry and under the control of a union—for by that time our people will surely return from our huge, overgrown cities back to the country. These towns will possess all the resources of civilisation. Here it is that emulation will show itself in its most splendid form as corporate pride; every trade and every town will try to surpass every other.

21. At length we have arrived at what, as a *datum* of ethics, is of cardinal importance, the outcome of the preceding intellectual rectification of our views of public authority, of our functions and their inter-relation.

In religious speculations it has often been observed, that two selves seem to be at war in us, each of which loves what the other hates, and hates what the other loves—our lower self and our higher self. We know that the latter is certainly more ourself than the former, and yet we cannot say, that the lower is not ourself, and when we enter the lists against it, it is in our own breast that we lay our lance at rest. This higher self, our true, our real self, indeed, is *our social self*: our self as member of society; for—and this is the important *datum*—*it is only as a member of society that the individual is at all real.*

This is not mere rhetoric or a metaphysical illusion. You may reply that surely it is a fact, that individuals make society, that they are real by themselves, and would remain real if every form of society were destroyed. No, that is precisely *not* a fact. Take a Frenchman. True, he may leave his own country, come over here, and here remain the same Frenchman he was before. True, also, that he may be conceived to remain what he now is, if all his countrymen were suddenly annihilated. But reflect a moment. Consider that this Frenchman was born into a certain French family; afterwards he was educated in a French school of some kind or other; finally, he was sent into the world to make his living or his fortune—a French world, please observe, of a higher or a lower character. Suppose you now try to perform the feat of abstracting from our Frenchman all that he derives from his family, from his teachers and comrades, from the station that he fills in manhood; abstract his “sameness” with others, that which he has in common with others, either all other Frenchmen or those of his own class—what is left? Will you please point out the residuum. Can you grasp it? Do not for a moment suppose that I affirm that nothing remains. It will be evident in the following that I not merely do not deny, but that I assert with emphasis that something of the highest importance, of almost exclusive importance, remains; but I say that this residuum has never existed

by itself; that if you take away all he possesses as a member of the French nation, he ceases to be a Frenchman, and more than that, he ceases to be a man, he ceases to be; you take him clear away from the world of reality. Instead, therefore, of saying, as Spencer's school does, that the individual is real and society abstract, the fact is that society is the real, and the individual the abstract.

But again, you insist that there certainly was a time when there was no society of any kind, when therefore individuals must have existed by themselves. Again, I say, facts contradict you. Go as far back as history can trace man, and you find him living in the social state; and if Darwin is right, then this social man descended from a social animal, and thus society was never made by individual men, but has all the time been prior to them.

Your instincts are stronger and better than your so-called "principles." You see the state serenely ignore these thin theories of "advanced thinkers" like so many cobwebs, and do things which these theories condemn, and the people morally approve. And when a national crisis occurs, the claims of individualism are contemptuously brushed aside, the heart of the nation beats loudly in the breast of every one of her members, and its safety is held far superior to our individual lives.¹

Our other "self," our lower "self," our false "self"—though our private self as opposed to our social self—is really not ourself, but only of ourself; that is to say it consists in the impulses, derived from our animal origin, and constitutes what theologians call "original sin;" in some of us this lower "self" is an active enemy of right, in others simply a more or less opposing drag. I am morally realised when I refuse to identify myself with this private self, when the whole knowingly wills itself in me, when I consciously develop the common life of all in myself. That is why, supposing myself absolutely alone in the world, there would be no morality at all, and nothing whatever for me to live for, and why the pure individualist is no member at all, but a parasitical excrescence.

¹ Many fruitful thoughts on this subject will be found in *Ethical Studies* by F. H. Bradley.

This *datum* seems to me perhaps the most important of all. It, in itself, accounts for family, society, and the moral sentiments. The "social self" accounts for our *personality*; it accounts for *conscience* as being the objective mind, self-conscious in the individual, the voice of the whole in the breast of each citizen, the utterance of the public spirit of the race in each social self, and I here suggest that this "social self" may, when we come to religion, help us considerably in clearing the atmosphere, for the mischief there is the intellectual muddle into which the word "personal" gets us when we apply it to God and immortality.

22. In the three chapters now concluded, we have, I think, the true *data of ethics*, thereby meaning the facts, and all the facts, that concur to constitute and develop morality, whether "absolute" or "relative." It follows that both Herbert Spencer's "*data*" and "ethics" are false. If we gather the former into three groups, it seems to me that this becomes apparent.

The basis of all his sociological speculations is his division of human affairs into war and industrialism. He coolly assumes, first, an unchanging warlike state, and following thereupon, a similarly unchanging industrial state. This involves to my mind a bundle of absurdities. It is evident that mankind must, to some extent, have been "industrial" from the very beginning, for how else could they have existed? Some individuals, clearly, must have been producers. But the worst absurdity is to consider an industrial state synonymous with a "sphere of contract," yet this state, according to Spencer, starts with catching game or fish in common: "benefits received proportionate to services rendered; *without this there can be no sociological division of labour*"—this dictum with one stroke wipes out slavery, serfdom and the wage-system. He, further, writes as if the environments of mankind were stationary, and evolution consisted in more and more adapting man to this environment. "The superior man is he whose faculties are best adjusted to the social requirements,"—a judgment which would make Judas Iscariot far superior to Jesus. It would, indeed, be much more correct to say, that evolution consists in more and more adjusting the social state to human nature.

The next *datum* of his is couched in some such involved, stilted sentence as this : "all along furtherance of individual lives has been the ultimate end ; when the aggregate is no longer in danger, the first object of pursuit, the welfare of units, no longer needing to be postponed, becomes the immediate object of pursuit." From many similar statements it is clear that Spencer teaches nothing less than this : that as evolution progresses, the bond between the individual and society is loosened. This is nothing but an enormous piece of dogmatism ; if historic facts contradict it, so much evidently the worse for the facts.

Lastly, a *datum* of "cardinal importance" is, that "conduct should be such as will produce a consciousness as much pleasurable and as little painful as may be," and that "men of different races, men of the same race, and even the same men at different periods have different standards of happiness." This is so, because, according to Spencer, pleasure and pain, or the surplus of pleasure over pain "to somebody and somewhere" is the end of moral action, the standard of morality, and hence the motive to it. This I deny. I say, that the motive to morality is different from the end of it. Next, I say that the end of morality must be objective, but pleasure is subjective ; that it must be an end to us as men, but pleasure is least distinctively human and shared by the beasts.

But Spencer's ethics takes in the beasts. "The conduct with which ethics deals is a part of conduct at large," and "there is a supposable formula for the activities of each species (of animals), which, could it be drawn out, would constitute a system of morality (*sic*) for that species." It may be added, that to assimilate the moral man still more to animals he makes the side remark : "The equilibrium reached at death. . . . is, of course, the final state which the evolution of the highest man has in common with all lower evolution." Is thus his *Data of Ethics* not rather "*Data of Selfishness*," or "*Data of Animal Well-being in Man*"?

The *Data* of these chapters, on the other hand, are these :

Full-fledged moral ideas did not come down from heaven, and if they had, they could not have been perceived, much less applied by man, but they are a growth, conditioned by man's social, and especially, industrial relations, each stage developing morality up

to a certain point, so that men at the end of Antiquity and of the Middle Ages were morally as much adjusted as they could be to their respective social requirements. There has been a constant evolution of these relations, and now we are on the threshold of their final development; hence our present uncomfortable feeling; the social organism may at present be said to be in its teething period. Think of the heart-burning there must be within the bud, when the full-blown rose is forming! What anxieties, what agitations, what asperities among the atoms!

The fundamental motive to morality is the inborn inclination to obedience in man. He must at all times obey something; he cannot obey what he knows to be a lie, nor what is lower than himself; he has, further, an innate inclination to obey the Order of the Cosmos, Universal Reason—and this becomes conscience in his own breast. Pleasure never can tell us which is the higher, which the lower function, but, at the most, whether the function is well-performed or not. From this it follows that morality concerns man only and all men.

As we progress, we find that we are more and more closely united to Society, and at last all will come to acknowledge that our true self is our social self.

Finally, the end of morals is morality itself—righteousness, *i.e.*, from one point of view: Self-realisation, the development of our social self; from the other: intensest Unity with our kind, the Organic Unity of men. And this, the *summum bonum*, does not end with the death of the individual.

Now at last we are in a position to determine from these *data* the future development of morality in its two grand divisions of *Duty and Love*.

CHAPTER IV.

DUTY OR JUSTICE.

“Free-will does not consist in doing any other thing but what nature, left to its own tendencies, would have accomplished; but it consists in doing this in the name of Universal Order and voluntarily.”—*Theo. Jouffroy*.

23. Moral ideas have not yet grown feebler than electricity in moulding the destinies of man. Would that I had the eloquence to show them in all their attractiveness, importance, and power, and thus move men's hearts and rouse their energies to realise them in a glow of defiance of obstacles!

Herbert Spencer has done one good service. By the title of his book, *Data of Ethics*, he has impressed upon people the right idea: that in order to understand Ethics, we must first study its *data*; in other words, that morality is founded upon facts.

We have seen in Chap. II. that morality is the offspring of the Empire of Necessity—of benevolent Necessity—of Universal Order, and means, when fully evolved, the conscious and voluntary co-operation towards the brotherhood and fellowship of man. When once men comprehend this, they will no longer commit the fearful blunder of looking down on morality as a silly, sentimental, unimportant matter, but must see it as it is: the most important thing in life, the main business for us all; the only thing, indeed, worth living and dying for—the *prize of life*; and also see that every other sort is a sham morality.

This is the remarkable and cheering fact, that so far it is Natural Evolution alone that will have directed our destiny. What a marvellous spectacle, that with all our struggles in the dark, with even good and noble men proceeding on cross purposes, we shall have come to our goal; that an innumerable multitude human beings, amidst discords, without concert and even con-

sciousness, have converged and concurred in the same general development, believing they were merely following their personal impulses! That morality is a product of evolution implies that it is something the universe through untold ages has been labouring to bring forth; and which, therefore, has a value proportionate to the tremendous efforts it has cost. It has been worked out by infinite pain, the sweat and blood of generations, yet is given to us by free grace, in love, as a sacred trust.

That by itself makes morality a transcendent, tremendous reality, something of priceless value.

We have noticed that our definition includes Free-will. Necessity or Order may be said to be the father of morality, and Free-will its mother. Free-will is subordinate, complementary to, limited by the Order in the world; the latter defines our aim in life, the end for which we have all been put into the world; but this end must be accomplished through us and by us. Free-will thus—as was announced by the French philosopher, Jouffroy, sixty years ago—consists in co-operating, consciously and voluntarily, with the Order of the Cosmos.

It is precisely by our Free-will, governed by right reason, that we are to develop morality in us and in the world to the utmost, and especially remove the obstacles which our Established Order throws in its path.

Mark now that morality itself is a fact.

A fact is something to which the whole universe must submit. A law says, "You ought, and if you do not you must bear the penalty." As has been said: "It may be questioned whether a law of nature—the law of gravitation, for example—is properly called a 'law' at all; it is simply a statement of a fact, regular, constant, invariable, if you please, but only a fact." Gravitation means, do this, and that other thing will invariably follow. This makes it a fact; and precisely in the same way morality is a fact.

This has been denied by the same writer above quoted. In a volume of lectures¹ it is said:

"We believe that the conditions of social welfare and prosperity, the sources of peace and satisfaction for each individual soul, are fixed. We

¹ *Ethical Religion*, by Wm. M. Salter.

know the law that makes this marvel of order which we see in this outward world. How simple and yet how far-reaching is the law of gravitation! But the law that would turn the chaos of human life into a cosmos we do not know. It differs from the law of gravitation very plainly in this, that *it does not act necessarily*; if it did, we should have already an order here comparable to that we see in the material world. But we have to discover it, and after we shall discover it, we shall have to give it the free consent of our wills."

Is there really the difference suggested? Why is it that the "law" of gravitation acts "necessarily?" Is it not, because in our solar system the requisite conditions are all the time present? But take another force, that of expansion—does that act constantly? No, it is at times latent, but it acts "necessarily" and immediately, whenever the fit conditions arise; yet surely it is as much a fact or "law" as gravitation. Precisely so it is with morality. Mr. Salter should have said that gravitation is constantly active, but that morality will not be a fully active force before the conditions appear—then it will act equally "necessarily."

It is to this lack of faith in morality that modern Pessimism is due.

There is really a striking parallel between our times and the decline of the Roman Republic—arising from the fact that that age was like ours, a transition period between one organic social order and another. The Romans had ceased to believe anything; all affairs were conducted solely with a view to self-indulgence. There were the most startling contrasts of enormous wealth and selfish luxury in the few, and abject poverty among the masses. Lowest down were sixty million slaves, hardly considered as human beings; above them were found the vast majority of free citizens, brutal, ignorant, dependent on the rich, and who, at night, after a day's attendance on their patrons, crept up to their wretched quarters in the sixth and seventh stories of the huge lodging-houses in Imperial Rome. Far above them were the wealthy classes, debauched, ostentatious, dragging out a weary monotonous life, the most virtuous of whom could reach no greater height than glorifying suicide, and whose other literature was most vicious and degraded.¹

¹ Canon Farrar in his *Early Days of Christianity*.

The principal difference between now and then lies almost exclusively in the superiority of our despised wage-workers over Rome's free citizens.

But is it not remarkable that as Pessimism reigned then, so it has raised its head in our times; and that it is just the cultured and fortunate classes—whose personal morality is unexceptional—that accept it and thereby condemn their civilisation.

This rise and spread of Pessimism in our days is a fact that must be explained, and its explanation is naturally identical with the reason for its existence among the Romans. True, it seems more startling in our days, on account of the jubilant chorus caused by railroads, telegraphs, and universal suffrage; but the note of desolation and despair has the same meaning, that, like the ancient civilisation, our own is hollow at the core. "There is a despondent feeling that Providence has dishonoured his acceptance and become a bankrupt as regards his promise to pay."

This simply comes from a narrow view of the whole process. Men do not see beyond their horizon; they fail to see that this, like the Roman decline, is but a necessary transition period, and suppose that our established order is the very summit of the evolution. Such seems also to be the opinion of Haeckel who, as we have seen, concludes that the moral ordering of the world is a "fable," finds nothing but "the selfish, pitiless, and immoral character of the whole contest everywhere," and declares that "the ceaseless, terrible struggle for existence gives the real impulse to the blind course of the world."

As soon as one can be convinced of the tremendous change which Socialism will accomplish, then all Pessimism will disappear like pestilent vapour.

We must for that purpose have a classification of the duties and virtues, that, on the one hand, does not run into infinite detail, and, on the other, is not merely a simple affirmation of general principles. Morality divides itself naturally into self-restraining and self-expanding Morality; the former is *Duty* or *Justice*—for what is my "duty" is "justice" to another, so these are correlative terms—with conscience as the active power, expressed in these three obligations: *Be industrious, be loyal, be straight.* The

latter is *Love*, with the affections as the active agents, divided into Love between the sexes, between parent and child, *sympathy* between "masters" and "servants," sympathy for our fellow-men, and *sacrifice*.

It is worth while to observe that, in this view, "self" becomes an integral part of morality, and should be cultivated rather than suppressed. A true philosophy teaches us that we cannot get away from our "self" any more than we can jump out of our own shadow, and now we see that if we could we should not at all profit by it. Under no ideal refinement of our nature could we ever habitually desire for others anything but what we would wish for ourselves. Our moral notions would, in fact, be destroyed, not improved, if we could possibly repress our personal instincts.

Let us recall our definition of conscience. In French that word means both our "conscience" and consciousness. That there is a close connection between these two ideas all admit. I take conscience to be: the Order of the Cosmos, of the whole, *conscious in each personality*, in each social life.

To this classification it will be objected that I have omitted duties to God and to oneself. I answer: the former, whatever they may be, belong to religion; and as to the latter, as to *honour*, *temperance and purity*, they, *in themselves*, are not duties or virtues, are not moral at all, since they have no tendency whatsoever to *unite men organically*. But they are raised into the moral sphere, if they are cultivated as a means to make us more efficient moral agents; they even, as we shall see in the next chapter, acquire an eminent moral value, if joined to the affections.

Truthfulness shows in a remarkable manner the all-importance of the social element. Not all truth is sacred, whatever the scientific, the positivist mind may say. Speaking the truth is held to be the ultimate basis of morality, yet only a certain kind of truth we respect, and it is social considerations that determine our choice. When a villain asks us the way to his victim, we think it right to tell him a lie; we hide to our friends the true conditions of health, if the truth would hasten their death; we do not reveal secrets which should be preserved, even when lying alone will preserve them, showing that we are aware that not all

truths are sacred ; that their sacredness depends not on themselves, but on their object, whether they contribute to social welfare or not. Suppose a man with a purely intellectual love of truth who acts like a calculating machine, and tells the truth on all occasions : he may be the greatest living scoundrel. Leslie Stephen considers the use of judicial oaths to be due to an imperfect respect for truth ; I should say it proves our acknowledgment of the social value of truth.

24. Unfortunately, purity, temperance, and honour, altogether too often remain exclusively personal ; in that case they become simply part of our miserable *conventional morality*, our church morality, and this is in truth the highest *immorality* : the exact opposite of true morality. While the latter intends and works to realise a perfect society and fellowship among men, the former divides them into cliques on the false lines of pride and property ; true morality *unites* us with our fellowmen, church morality *actually separates us from each other*.

Conventional morality is true Pharisaism. I have not the least doubt, that if Jesus should now walk in the flesh among us, he would denounce our self-righteous Christians as fiercely as ever he did the Pharisees of old. He would, I apprehend, tell our "better citizens," men who have never known what real temptation means, and who think themselves far superior to a poor devil who has been sorely tempted every hour of his waking life : "You deem yourself infinitely more respectable than the inmates of your prisons, and would think yourself insulted to be compared to them. I tell you, that some of these have had their ideals to which they have tried faithfully to live up, that with all their faults they have loved the beautiful, the good, and the true ; they have withstood temptation once, they have manfully conquered it the second time, but fell perhaps at the third assault. You, my dear sir, who have never had a wish to be better than you are, and have always been supremely selfish, are infinitely inferior to such a man. Yet, fool ! you fancy that God applauds such a decent piece of respectability as you ! Go, you whited sepulchre !—your so-called virtues are reptile virtues—varnished vices !"

That is a successful virtuous life in the old sense of the word. It is a life of duty and duty is a fine morality.

Ah ! I can fancy some—a few at least—of our rich people, at all events here and there a young, generous, thoughtful son or daughter of such, who, in these days of moral awakening, are roused by their conscience, and haunted by the thought : “ Can it be that we rich people are robbers ? Have we any right to the position we occupy ? ” If they go to their pastors with their doubts, they surely will get no satisfaction there, or they will have their doubts lulled to sleep, for our \$5000 ministers, whether Baptists, Episcopalians, or Unitarians, are, with very, very few exceptions, unfaithful ministers, whose only function seems to be to *drug* the world’s conscience. It cannot but be, however, in spite of this drugging, that at their balls and midnight suppers some of them must see in the look and attitude of the haggard faces in the street a claim upon them, and to have the thought branded into their brains : “ We are rioting on stolen goods. ”

Heretofore such rich people have had their excuses. They were blind to the actual facts, and no one opened their eyes. But now the fulness of the truth is dawning upon them and upon the world. Now you come to see that if you leave a boy or girl in squalor and misery, so imbedded in criminality that you might lay your hands on each one and say that if not rescued by a miracle he or she will inevitably become a thief and a murderer, you rich people are answerable for their crimes ! *You are the real thieves and murderers*, and if you do not acknowledge it, it were better a millstone were hanged around your neck and you cast into the sea !

Well, it is wonderful, how quickly the world of late has progressed in the quickening of the moral sense. Fifty years ago the working classes themselves and their best friends did not see any wrong whatever in the wage-system. Now the Bishops of the Episcopal Church issue a pastoral denouncing that system, with its principle that labour is a merchandise, as unchristian and immoral. Yes, look upon this vast toiling population, often tramping from place to place, thrice blessed when it gets into a squalid corner of a workshop or factory, and allowed to pursue an eternal monotonous operation for eleven hours a day, so situated, that it cannot employ itself, crouching at the feet of another class, from whom

it gets only a supply of insults and mockery and a crown of thorns for the brow of despised humanity. The worst of the present system, as already said, but cannot be too often repeated, is by no means that it makes some rich and leaves others poor, but that by placing one class in the power of another class, to be used as means to its ends, it destroys all truly human relations between them.

That is conventional morality: materialism triumphant, an overpowering lust of mammon, virtue reduced to the *caput mortuum* of self-interest, a low theory of life, a lost ideal of heroism.

There are "Christians" amongst us who have exemplified the highest degree of purity, temperance, and honour, and at the same time entirely disregarded the social self, held aloof from humanity, and looked upon the world as a defilement. We have seen them expel from their Communion members who had entered the Union Army to fight against slavery, but they never expelled stock-brokers or speculators, oh, no! If Jesus were here with his scourge, I am sure he would flog every one of them out of the temple. They have faithfully copied the example of Joseph, the great Hebrew minister of finance, who, having secured a large store of corn, permanently reduced the Egyptians to bondage by fixing a 20% tax on the industrial classes.

If this is so with "moral" men, no wonder the ordinary worldling hardly understands that society even can have different aims. But soon these things will be burnt as a scroll in the fierce heat of the Eternal!

Let it be distinctly known that the man who cultivates purity, temperance, and honour in quakerish pride of individuality, that he may stand aloof from common humanity and be considered better than others, is a nauseous, loathsome Pharisee.

25. No, Providence has not become bankrupt, but Satan has, apparently, been permitted temporarily to reign. Not at all the old-fashioned devil nor the mocking Mephistopheles, however. There are in Boston two busts by T. J. Gould: one representing Jesus, the other Satan. On looking at the latter some must say

to themselves: "Surely I meet frequently with such a face as this; its chief expression is precisely what marks the faces of so and so, our most enterprising and successful business men." That is to say, the expression is, not malevolent, but supremely selfish, that of a man going straight to his end without a thought of others, perfectly indifferent to their feelings, and whether he hurts them or not, with at most a sneer for their weakness. This is the spirit that rules affairs at present and has ruled them for the last century, which indisputably, during that period has, under Providence, contributed materially to progress, and done a work that had to be done and for which such a spirit was best fitted. It is the spirit that animates practically all our successful business men, and now has full control of even the Church, in all its branches—of which, however, the evangelical is the most immoral, as it, with its Pharisaical zeal, makes morals consist in paltry and shabby personal aspirations.

The most horrible work of this satanic spirit is, that it makes society tempt us all wrongly. Nothing can be conceived more devilish than this; it and Pharisaism are the two very worst phases of modern morals. To be sure, none of us is, of course, compelled to become a thief and a swindler, but that is a small favour. Think of it, and let it sink deep into your heart: that society which ought to throw her powerful motives into the scale of right, *actually does constantly and persistently tempt all her members into evil ways.* What father is not horrified at knowing his pure, innocent daughter tempted, whatever faith he has in her virtue!

And it is a fact. All our relations in life can furnish examples, and the following pages will call attention to some of the most revolting. The conception of life as a competitive race makes property the sole thing worth a man's pursuit, and the most commendable; by producing for profit, I am made to consider whether each stroke will *pay*; whether I had not better scamp this and hurry over that; I grudge every stroke of the tool. Commercial men cannot afford to be strictly honest; by having their labour miserably remunerated, women are tempted to prostitution. But in the face of this terrible fact it is truly wonderful how many good people there are in the world. This is something that ought

to greatly encourage us and strengthen our faith in man's destiny. Satan is defeated by the very fact that, under the existing circumstances, men are *as good as they are*.

The very worst of the social temptations is, that wealth has become the great social power, and it is here that wealth is injurious. It is not that the purple and fine linen of Dives cause Lazarus to be in rags, for that is not true of the modern rich man—the reverse indeed is rather the truth. "What makes him a dangerous social growth is that, by controlling the heap of wealth of which all others need and *must have* a share, he exercises a double pressure on the needy who serve him either with hand or head: by picking out the favoured ones, and by dictating his own terms. It is thus through the distribution of his money that he gets his dangerous power—the monopoly of what all want makes his power so fatal. He parts with his cheque, and he gets all nice things: adulation, professional skill, paragraphs in newspapers, the disposal of places. He spends, and has the world at his feet in the spending; he can hardly help saving, and his savings increase like a rolling mass of snow, without effort."¹

This results in an indiscriminate respect for wealth. No one would bear an extra burden of business to have a cellar of choice wines for one's own drinking, or would be lying awake of nights devising means of getting richer, to provide one's wife with a carriage—it is the increased social distinction, the *éclat* of the wines and carriages that has the strong motive power. This deference can always be had by accumulating property, and this can be accomplished by one of very mediocre attainments, if he possess cheek and cunning.

This power of "lording it" over others is surely an evil and the desire for it a low desire, filling the one with vanity and an overbearing spirit, the other with servility, envy, and a smothered hatred, and dividing the nation against itself. It is not in human nature to be just and humane when robbed of life's fundamental conditions. The rich man's sympathies are naturally seared; he comes to think that other people exist solely for his benefit and that they are of an inferior order, fit only for labour. It is one of

¹ Prof. Graham's *Social Problems*.

the ugly sides of human nature that we treat our needy brothers with contumely; it needs the most exalted nature under the highest civilisation to think of acting otherwise.

How much worse is it then when riches have been acquired—as in our days they to a greater or less extent are in nine cases out of ten—by speculation, that is to say, by pure gambling. That is the greatest proof of the dominion of Satan, that the churches are everywhere in his service, that all they are now witnesses to, is “the principles of property,” no matter how acquired. It is notorious that ministers, as often as they can spare a few dollars, put them into margins and stocks. Henry Ward Beecher declared, before a legislative committee, that cornering food-products—a crime in the Middle Ages—is a legitimate business. And Washington Gladden, a man with some very noble impulses, must undoubtedly have some speculators in his congregation, since he can write: “Speculation, when it hoards the necessities of life, may often be a heartless and injurious business; it may, on the other hand, have beneficent results, equalising the pressure of demand and supply. Society can have no quarrel with them.” Well, I apprehend, a moral Collective Conscience will by and by have some quarrel with scoundrels who gamble in the necessities of life by manipulating demand and supply.

Meanwhile no provision whatever is made for those writers and thinkers who are doing the very highest work which man on earth can do for his fellows. Even these, the large majority of them, the money-bag uses for his ends, pays for his purposes, hiring them as formerly soldiers of fortune were hired, all the time despising them, since they have not the sense to make money. And on the small minority, the very highest minds, the prophets in Israel, the most terrible probation is put merely in order to live, to vegetate rather, and do their work, yet patient under insults and mockeries and the crown of thorns that is put upon them, “for they know not what they do.” They are in many cases even refused the poor privilege of earning their living by manual labour because they dare to attack the system. Of course society is full to the brim of hypocrisies and insincerities in the spiritual sphere as of evils and injustice in the social. But had

there been provision for the modest wages of these workers in payment for their proper work, the world would have been far beyond our present stage in thought, letters, and conceptions of life, and the kingdom of heaven might have been here.

Instead of that kingdom, where the strongest, healthiest, most perfectly organised, one of finest physique, largest brain, most developed intelligence, and best morals, would be the leaders, this satanic competition protects, flatters, and fosters those in every way unworthy. Why! to use a hypothesis, effectually employed by St. Simon seventy years ago: Suppose a hundred of the most "prominent" individuals in each department of industry and the professions—aye, and in some departments even thousands—removed in one night from our country, does not everybody know that this, so far from being a loss, would be a positive gain to our country's interests?

Let this thought sink deeply into our minds: that the established order tempts us all to despise labour, to encourage disloyalty, dishonesty, and impurities of every sort.

26. We pass now to the great moral obligations, and shall inquire, first, how the established order affects them, and next, how Socialism will influence them. Our wage-earners, undoubtedly, will think it quite superfluous to address to them the precept: "Be industrious!" as they will say that they are quite as industrious as anybody ought to be, toiling, as they do, eleven hours a day for a mere living. To be "industrious," however, involves more than being active: it includes devoting all our thoughts to our work, making that work as artistic as it admits of, and particularly being careful that nothing is wasted. There is good authority for the statement that the question of success or failure of many a large establishment depends solely on this matter of waste. That our wage-earners are often deficient in these secondary matters is true beyond any question; but it is just as true that they have at present no motive to be anything else. Consider simply how productive work is now depreciated, and how the non-productive industries—the mere incidents of production—are endowed with a far higher social rank than the productive ones.

It would really be comical, if it were not really tragical. Look and see how a mere trader or speculator, who requires no skill, no apprenticeship, and but a very low order of intellect, not alone absorbs wealth far more rapidly, but enjoys a far superior esteem than the thoroughly trained mechanical producer. It is enough to make devils laugh to see the poor mechanic look up to the trader, the banker, and contractor as almost superior beings, and yet they are fellows who only handle his product.

This is completely to reverse the proper order by honouring the least worthy, and deteriorating and degrading the truly meritorious. Why, it is monstrous that vendors of goods, those who merely carry goods from one place to another, are able to earn twice as much in half the time as the producers, and, besides this, to make immense fortunes at the expense of the consumers. And to think that this is not alone tolerated but acquiesced in without a suspicion of those who suffer most that anything is wrong, because these shrewd distributors of wealth have used every available form of deception, misrepresentation, and strategy to create the belief that they—they who often are nothing but parasites—are the most important of all the social elements. So potent has been their influence, that any protest by the well-wishers of the wage-earners has only to be by them labelled "Socialism," and their victims immediately assent.

It cannot be difficult to see that this has had a most mischievous tendency to depreciate productive industry itself. It has prevented the intellectual and moral elevation of producers directly deteriorating the quality, and diminishing the quantity of wealth produced, and, moreover, has drawn the best minds away from productive labour to waste their time in trade and speculation, perfectly barren of inspiring sentiments. Indeed, if we go down to the bottom of the matter, we shall find that, because industry always has been and is the foundation of society, all the empires of the past have failed from the slight regard paid to it. Athens alone among the Greek States rose at all superior to the pride which contemned it, and she had her reward in the glory she gained for all time. But on account of the prejudice shown by the Hebrew race, it was dispersed, nor could all the skill

of Roman administration avert the decay wrought by its disdain both of agricultural and artisan labour.

Consider further the motives which the worker has for being in the true sense industrious, and the motives he has for being otherwise; and, if you are fair, you will admit that the latter far overbalance the former. Remember only that our working men have on an average but 7 dols. a week, that a man seldom has constant employment, that even sober and industrious wage-earners in our most favoured states cannot make both ends meet without the wages of their children: can you wonder, is it anything but human nature that our jails never want occupants? When you know that girls get only three dollars a week, and must pay for board, room, washing, and clothing, and—why not?—a bit of finery, I ask you, my Pharisaic sir, is it anything but human nature if she submits to the temptation of a young fellow of your class?

•I have not a particle of doubt that our present trade-unions will be the skeletons of the future Social Order. That is to say, all useful citizens of the future socialist commonwealth will form themselves into a number of corporate bodies—let us simply for convenience' sake call them "Trade-Unions." We shall thus have all social activities of whatsoever kind performed by such unions of butchers, bakers, tailors, and likewise of teachers, judges and physicians, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Every active man will join some union, so that "scabs" will be unknown. Each of these unions will be on a perfect equality with every other union, and each perform its function in perfect liberty and determine for itself all the details of the work as to how many hours a day its members will work, whether it shall be day or night work and the ratios in which to distribute the remuneration. The only control to which they, in the nature of things, must submit—or rather supervision—is that of the central administration which, as the general manager, will from the statistics of the previous year fix the number, say, of coats to be made the current year and distribute the amount among the various tailor unions; this central administration, further, as a matter of necessity, in conjunction with the representatives of the unions, determines the remuneration to

be paid for the work and the consequent price of the products, since this is a public question.

With wages surely double those paid at present, and the hours of labour at least reduced to six hours—to which extent, without the least doubt, the socialist republic immediately will, and safely can, improve the condition of the workers; with work suitable, and therefore pleasant, and subject only to rules which every member has had a hand in framing (in the rare cases where the majority has been overbearing and unjust there will undoubtedly be opportunity for redress from the collectivity as arbitrator or judge); with uninterrupted labour, for with no over-production, there will be no crisis, as there will be no strikes or lock-outs—for to strike means to starve—will the workmen of the future not be like a new being? The shoemaker, the baker, or the weaver who now sees no horizon beyond the wall of the little cell in which he lives, and in which the tedium and monotony of his occupation might well lead *him* to ask, “Is life worth living?” will under Socialism breathe quite a different atmosphere, and, from the thoughts and feelings that accompany his work, indefinitely increase the energy, ingenuity, and painstaking bestowed upon it. That is simply the natural difference between occupation, looked upon subjectively as an elementary need, essential to human life, and objectively as the discharge of a needed social function.

The picture will be still far brighter if we let our imagination riot among the far-reaching changes which will result secondarily from such a state of affairs—among which is one, once alluded to, which will surely be started the moment Socialism triumphs, and which will vastly stimulate sympathy and emulation and through them industry—and that is the return of the population from our cities back into the country. No one can now perceive a limit to the increase of cities like London, New York, and Boston, yet there must be a limit, for it is an expansion highly detrimental to social interests. Under the established order there can be no halt, because evolution needs the large cities in order to effect the coming change, and bring the nation to self-consciousness.

But with the advent of the large corporate industrial bodies, each pursuing a different industry or branch of it, each of which

will naturally make a chosen nook or corner of our country the seat of it, we shall have the Greek "cities" of old resurrected, but on a far higher plane. These same bodies will of course construct and administer the municipal organisations, and make them the most perfect social organisms. We shall thus have small towns everywhere, each comprising all the vast benefits of our present metropolitan cities, but without their horrible evils; each with every appurtenance of educational and æsthetical apparatus. What a wonderful moral influence will issue from them! All will know themselves as indispensable, integral, and equivalent parts of the whole whose conduct has a collective bearing. This world will thus no longer be the empire of the devil, but a true *Civitas Dei*—City of God.

The established order makes us despise labour and respect "business." Socialism will strongly incite us all to industry.

• 27. "Be loyal," is really, in plain words, the same as "be obedient," but our commonplaces about "liberty" have had the effect of raising in ordinary minds a strong presumption against obeying any body—though by a natural rebound the further consequence has been to induce people to obey the first one who claims this allegiance with sufficient self-confidence. It is curious that our evolution-moralists do not mention obedience at all as one of the virtues; yet, in sober truth, it is and must remain the very basis of Morality.

Moreover, to obey a *real* superior is a great blessing, essential to achieving anything great. As has been said, "Command and obedience stand at the very entrance to life. The tacit assumption that it is a degradation to give one's will to that of another is the root of all evil." To regard subordination as a humiliation is surely a mark, not of spirit, but of a base disposition, subversive of everything worth having in life.

In any society that wishes to start at a certain point command and obedience necessarily ensue. Whenever the aim is not personal but common to all, the best man is readily found. In scientific, literary, and philosophic societies whose aim is the truth, we know the best men are soon known. When all pursue the

same inquiries, and are animated by the same aims, those whose knowledge is most extensive are at once recognised, appointed to posts of honour, and loyally revered. When, on the other hand, the object is self interest, there is no hope of finding the man, or of his being revered when found.

Whether obedience is rightful or wrongful depends entirely upon who it is that commands. We saw in the previous chapter that the two important principles of trades-unions are : that direction of affairs belongs to the capable, and that all subordinates should intelligently co-operate. No one pretends that our wage-earners do that ; they are virtually still in a *quasi-servile* state and in no sense a source of public opinion. They have no effective choice of those to whom they must submit ; at the utmost they can, to a limited extent, choose "masters." No wonder they hate the very word obedience, and that loyalty has almost died out amongst them, for they know subordination only in its harshest form ; remember that such a skilled and intelligent body of operators as telegraphers were compelled a few years ago to sign a pledge not to enter the Knights of Labour organisation.

It is very curious that Spencer and all evolution-moralists cannot see beyond this transition period and "contracts." They evidently cannot get over the idea that these two categories are to be crystallised for all eternity. "As civilisation advances status passes into contract"—and then it stops as if in a *cul-de-sac*. No, be sure "contract" is, like the times in which we are living, a transitory arrangement, a connecting link, so to say, between the status of the Middle Ages, *status by birth*, and that of the future, *status by function*. Every contract confers authority upon one of the parties. The power of a French minister of the Interior over an immense number of subordinates is formidable and produces inequality in its harshest and least sympathetic form ; to say that it supersedes obedience is a poor kind of irony. The power of particular persons over their neighbours has never in any age of the world been so well defined and so easily and safely exerted as at present. Moreover, it ought to be noted, that contracts are in their very nature immoral. Whenever two make a contract, it is implied, if not expected, that it will prove onerous to one of

the parties; that one will "get the better" of the other of the parties; the meaning of the contract then is, that the party that is ruined, or, at least, not fairly remunerated for his expense or labour, must nevertheless stick to it. Well, there can be no doubt that we shall return to status; that is to say, as we formerly had status fixed by birth, we shall have status determined by *capacity*.

No well-informed and frank man can pretend that our employers are the most capable. There is probably not a single manufacturing establishment, mercantile or banking house, where the chief is not inferior in intellect and mental breadth to several of his subordinates. It is inevitable, as we saw, under our present system which immensely narrows the horizon of the successful "self-made" man. Thus all obedience is now positively immoral. For the case is not mended even by the chief being the ablest of all, since he now is moved by self-interest and not by social interest. Loyalty to a selfish individuality is immoral; loyalty to society is moral precisely because the latter is moved by an ideal. And if we take so able a wretch as Napoleon, whose genius ministered only to selfish vanity and created in him a sentiment of "aloofness" to the social organism—to be loyal to such an individual is criminal. Such genius is satanic, and ought to be swept from humanity's workshops very much as a carpenter sweeps out into oblivion the shavings that encumber his work.

There is then at present no foundation for, no motive whatever to loyalty, but this Socialism will entirely reverse. A change, indeed, will be effected by the mere fact that those who now are the wage-workers will—not become the ruling class—but will have their influence greatly increased. Now there is fortunately in that class an ingrained reverence for mental superiority, in many cases even for superiority that is but half-genuine. That is a characteristic which our Carnegies and Weedens and our half-educated, self-made men cannot understand, and hence they rave about "Asiatic despotism" as often as they speak of labour organisations. It is a reverence they themselves are generally strangers to: they have a horror of trusting freely a qualified man to do a definite work, a feeling rarely found among our artisans, who, on

the contrary, show a great readiness to accept personal leaders. That is the way the working men of both Anglo-Saxon countries have gone about their affairs, the way they have made their organisations powerful and themselves respected. That is how they put in practice their two principles of rule of capacity and responsibility—in other words realised democracy.

Evolution seems to me clearly to point to this as the political model for the socialist republic, with loyalty and obedience as the consequence.

Since all useful citizens become public functionaries, each will really in his place perform his share of the government, for what is the "government" of a nation, but performing the work of a nation? But the distinctive feature of "democracy," which we now emphasise, will be that all the administrators will be elected *from below*. I claim this is the only sure way of getting in a manner, satisfactory to all, ability at the head of affairs. Remember that it is *sine qua non* that the initial voters shall enjoy perfect independence and security. Think of such arguments as these: Are such men not, in the first place, all things considered, the most competent to elect their immediate foremen? Do they not know the qualifications of their comrades, who are the candidates, and at the same time the duties of him who is to oversee them? And are they not, also, they who are most interested in having over them both the ablest and the most just man? By having the operatives *elect* their foremen, the foremen their superintendent, the superintendents their superiors, and so on up to the chief of departments, we surely secure this one thing, that *each officer has the good-will of those under him*. And, on the other hand, if we entrust the *dismissal* of every officer to his immediate superior who is responsible for the performance of the duties by that officer, and therefore must have the power of dismissing or rejecting him if unfit, we insure the efficiency of the administrator, and *the good-will of superiors*.¹ Can there be a doubt that by such a scheme ability will necessarily gravitate towards the highest posts? At any rate, it must be admitted that such a plan is the only one that never yet has been tried. It conforms to the nature

¹As to details see my *Co-Operative Commonwealth*.

of true ability—a different thing entirely from the “ability” of our self-made men. True merit, we have seen, is invariably modest, needs to be pushed forward and have its opportunities created, and to lean upon the judgment of others, while it is out of its element in struggling against others and against obstacles.

Ah, if you able men in these United States could only get a glimpse of the working of a co-operative commonwealth with all its consequences, you would, I am sure, merely from honourable ambition, embrace Socialism to a man, and give it a tremendous impetus. Why, plenty of men will in that social order become great by the mere grandeur of the work which will be given them to do! The future has a field for great and heroic leaders of men, such as the past cannot show, a field all the grander and loftier both morally and intellectually because it will consist in the free leadership of intelligent wills, because it will be the embodiment of fully developed units.

We shall have no more scrambles for the insignia of power by manipulating primaries of caucuses, that incapacity may fill its own pockets or air its own vanity. The future chief will not be a human tool to be dictated to, but a man of the people's choice, *who leads*; he will be continually initiating, devising, suggesting. He will never force, never be forced; he will sometimes create opinion on which alone he rests for strength by honestly forcing the conviction that he is right. Consent will then give him a far higher power than any material force now does.

It has been said that if the Black Prince were living he would change his motto, “Ich dien” (I serve), to “Je paie” (I pay); the motto will yet once more come to honour.

Here are two social systems, the future democracy, inspired by working-men, and the present republic, modelled by middlemen. Working-men are distinguished by breadth of view, power of combination, social spirit, and loyalty to leaders. Middlemen, big and small, are absorbed in petty details, harassed by ceaseless competition, and narrowly practical. That is what often makes our strikes so bitter, that employers cannot conceive that any one seriously prefers combined strength to independent helplessness.

The established order incites to disloyalty; Socialism will tempt to manly obedience.

28. Be straight, "*integer*." A man of integrity is the very essence of duty, and here it is we fail most completely. Of course some regard for truth is implied in the simplest social state, and without some measure of honesty we could not get along at all. The special necessity for confidence in the mutual relations of human beings develops to some extent the sense of honour, and the other special necessity, that anything which is done or made should really be what it purports to be, develops to some extent integrity in work, or honesty. Only the third branch of truth: reality in knowledge, brought about by the necessity of understanding the real world with which we are in incessant relation, has been fully attained, because it does not come into collision with our interests.

Since all our social relations are one sole web of conspiracy to tempt us, it is no wonder that life is a mass of dishonesties. Business life tempts us to be untruthful; at all events it is on a footing of enmity with openness, requiring, as it does, secrecy, and in certain cases deception. Everywhere we meet with temptation to lying, which comes next to, and very near to, compulsion. Scarcely a transaction is ever consummated without some form of deception being practised. The ability to "drive a bargain" is nothing else but a certain species of cunning in making facts appear different from what they are, whereby customers are beguiled into paying more than its value for an article. Taking society as it actually is, everyone expects everyone else to practise a certain amount of deception, and one failing to do so would be adjudged scarcely possessed of the full complement of "wits." The suppressio veri is fully employed, the impression prevailing that no wrong is done, unless a positive falsehood is resorted to, though surely it is the effect, not the form, that is material. Even Herbert Spencer, the apostle of individualism, informs us that "as the law of the animal creation is 'eat or be eaten,' so of the trading community it may be said its motto is 'cheat or be cheated.'" Men in different occupations, men naturally conscien-

11

tious, who manifestly chafe under the degradation they submit to, have one and all expressed the sad belief that it is impossible to carry on trade with strict rectitude. The scrupulously honest must go to the wall. "And nobody seems ashamed of these things; they are not only tolerated but actually defended." Spencer sums up the indictment in these words: "Illicit practices of every form and shade, from venial deception up to all but direct theft, may be brought up to the higher grades of our commercial world."

"Liable to prompt dismissal as the assistants in our stores are for non-success in selling; gaining higher positions as they do in proportion to the quantities of goods they dispose of profitably; applauded, certainly not reprov'd, for any dishonest tricks, these young people often display a scarcely credible demoralisation and speak almost continuous falsehoods. Whatever is needed to effect a sale must be said." "Any fool can speak the truth." It is said that the universal practice is to make goods up in lengths shorter than they profess to be. Silk is "weighted" with soap or sugar. Manufacturers get designs by making workmen steal them—that is a very common offence. Insensibly, almost irresistibly, men are thrust into trade-immorality. We will say, some utterly unconscientious trader is the first to introduce some new form of fraud. The more upright merchants are continually tempted to adopt this questionable device which those around them are practising; the greater the number that yields, the more unequal the battle. The pressure of competition becomes more and more severe—finally they are compelled to follow the unscrupulous leader. Is it not startling—is it not enough to condemn this present to know that generous, upright men, of fine moral nature, are compelled to imitate the greatest knaves in the trade, at the risk of bankruptcy?

- It is told of a draper in England who carried his conscience into his shop, that he refused to commit the current frauds of his trade, whereby his business became so unremunerative that twice he became a bankrupt, so that he actually by his bankruptcies inflicted more evils upon others than he would have inflicted upon his customers by committing the usual trade-dishonesties.

Spencer asks: "What are 'accommodation bills' but practically forgeries?" And what a frightful commentary could be made on the legal, commercial rule, *caveat emptor*! "You must assume that he who sells you a thing is a scoundrel."

And yet there is no good reason to assume that the trading classes are intrinsically worse than others. We all continually fall into such temptations as are open to us. Few classes, if any, are free from immoralities that are as great as the above, relatively to temptation.

Take politics. Everyone admits that they are carried on by systematic corruption. But one phenomenon really surpasses all the rest. What can be more brazen and shameful—is the trade of the harlot more demoralising?—than to see a society like Tammany Hall, formed for the express purpose of grasping public offices for its members—an office-broking concern—openly showing itself off to the public, and presenting itself as a type of "democracy?"

This lack of integrity naturally affects our men of talent and genius, and makes them degenerate into mere instruments of narrow personal interests; hence our scientists are satisfied with superficial conceptions; our artists indulge in unprincipled creations to achieve a rapid and ephemeral popularity; our inventors care nothing for important inventions, and give their time to nothing but lucrative pursuits—melancholy results indeed, deprived of all moral value, and which have a still worse influence on men of second-rate abilities. Selfishness perverts and paralyses the most eminent powers.

Whenever a private enterprise is now broached, none asks whether the work is wanted, or will be useful to the community, or a means of healthy life to the enterprising individual, or whether it is honest, can be carried on without being defiled, or even whether he likes it, no, but *does it pay*? And, observe, it is our comfortable classes that ask this "professional" question. If it does not promise so and so much per cent. on capital, it is dropped. "Yet clearly," as has been said, "it would be a better paying thing with but one per cent., if it would make one happy, with helpers around one contented, children growing up under

healthy conditions, and producing genuine and useful articles, than with ten per cent. with jangling and wrangling, over-worked and sad faces around us, and dirty, deceptive stuff produced.¹

To conclude the indictment: our whole mercantile and financial class is nothing but a criminal class in regard to the bulk of their incomes and fortunes. Our "best people" reek with dishonesties. The hordes of stock and share-mongers (including ministers of the gospel) are the criminal classes *par excellence* in our modern society. Every man and woman among us is continually tempted by our social arrangements to be dishonest. Should not one with a healthy mind do all he can to overthrow such a system?

Now let Socialism reverse the conditions of society. Make it, in the first place, man's interest to be honest. When the work of anybody is no longer a tribute to physical necessity, but a glad performance of social office, when a few hours of agreeable effort daily will secure all necessities, decencies, and comforts, why should any rational man want to steal, or cheat, or rob? Why should anybody want to make a living by crime when he can far more easily make it by honest effort?

Next, let wealth cease to be a social power—as it will when everyone has an assured income, for it is precisely such a power because others need a part of it. No one will care to be wealthy, when his wealth can only be eaten and drunk and enjoyed by himself and his friends, when it cannot tempt others to be his servants.

And, lastly, make all work a social function—this is the most important of all and all-comprehensive. When a butcher is assured of a decent living—not as a *quid pro quo*, but as a means enabling him to perform his function—when his maintenance in old age and the future of his children are guaranteed, when he knows that in the innumerable circles where he figures as a consumer his interests are taken care of, then be sure he will soon learn in his work to give society the first consideration, then he will devote himself entirely to *furnish his customers with good meat at fair prices*. It is nothing but human nature. Then we shall

¹ See Ed. Carpenter's *England's Ideal*.

have the motives at work which ruled "when all England awoke every morning and went to its work with a prayer."

29. All things human have an ideal, a soul, in them. The soul of our established order is that brute-god, Mammon, the modern Satan, and he has made wealth our ideal. He must be dethroned, and a spirit-god put in his place: the New Ideal be realised. And it will be done, for *the "ought" in us is prophetic of a perfect society and a perfect morality.*

The distinction between the New Ideal and Conventional Ethics is as radical as between the Copernican and the Ptolemaic systems. Conventional Morality takes the individual man as its centre, and by so doing all active men push and snatch and compete to get the most from each other, "cozen their neighbours" and keep them apart. This sort of morality never yet worked out a beautiful, blessed and happy life, and it never failed more signally than in our days.

The new ideal recognises a new centre: society, for each man's thoughts and activities; it does not ignore the individual by any means; it will precisely realise the highest kind and best in quality of individual welfare; moreover, it only explains "that dim sense of a compelling ought, a true race-instinct—that always bound man to do what he did not choose and what he could not see would benefit him at all."

Then we shall act, not from duty, but from spontaneity.

Mr. Salter says in his *Ethical Religion*: "The wide earth might be a scene of justice to-morrow, and every city of our land transformed into a City of the Light, if men and women would wake with to-morrow's sun to will the good which now lies like a half-formed vision in their minds."

I believe this is a great mistake. I think no "willing" can do what unripe conditions forbid. The co-existence of the perfect man and an imperfect society is impossible. There must be congruity between the conduct of each member of society and others. "If all recognise only the law of the strongest, one whose nature does not allow him to inflict pain goes to the wall, and truthfulness brings ruin among a treacherous people," as Spencer truly says.

But by-and-bye the lower attributes of our nature will one by

one be degraded in estimation and the emphasis will fall on higher qualities, and so our admiration for, and emulation of, the moneyed man will disappear. Man's hell was once physical inferiority; soon it will be stupidity, moral obliquity, and a selfish animal existence. There will be a gradual creation or discovery of common interests, common pleasures and sources of enjoyment, resolving a seeming conflict into real unanimity of interests, and effecting the magic transformation of exclusively self-regarding into social impulses.

What men and women should do on waking to-morrow, is resolve to *help along the birth of new conditions*, and then go to work.

They can be assured of success. The obstacles to be overcome are but superficial: the inertia, the thoughtlessness of men and the promptings of the present satanic social system. But the Order of the Cosmos, the powerful undercurrent is on their side, and the instinct of "ought to do," now proved identical with "*will be*," should convert even our pessimists into optimists.

Meanwhile it is well to ponder these sound and noble words of Jouffroy:

The "man who has least accomplished his destiny, the greatest criminal, the most immoral man, has yet fulfilled it to some extent, has exercised to a certain degree his human personality; and on leaving the world, however bad he may have lived, he is quite another being than on entering it; he is now, even with the crimes committed, a being like unto God. He has deliberated, chosen, has deceived himself, but he has exercised his noble faculties: he was a thing, he is a person. Life is useless to nobody. It is with an immense indulgence that we ought to judge our fellows as God himself judges us."

In closing, let me observe that duty, however important, is not the vital part of morality. Love is the essence. Duty is the fibre of the tree, not the pith; the foundation, not the house. They who consider duty everything are like a man so intent upon sinking the foundation of his house to the greatest possible depth that he at last finds his ostentatious labour swallowed up of quick sands.

CHAPTER V.

LOVE.

“God has divided Man into men, that they might help each other.”

—Seneca.

30. This is the place where I should especially wish for talents of persuasion, for now we have entered into the region of high morality, and also here the Established Order opposes our best efforts and is unceasingly active in leading us astray. This fact must not be slurred over; at the same time it should be borne in mind that the obstacles are merely superficial, due to man's inertia, thoughtlessness, and ignorance, while the noiseless undercurrent of the Universal Order, Universal Reason, is carrying us irresistibly onward. The agent which the Universal Reason here employs as the social bond is a far mightier one than that considered in the previous chapter. There it was conscience which *restrains* “self”; here it is the affections which *expand* “self.” Conscience does not point to heights of aspiration, but takes cognisance only of what falls below a certain line; the affections stimulate.

Affection: that wonderful guest within the human bosom, the outcome of physical passion—that, surely, is the happiest feat of Evolution! Its first advent, like the first appearance of every pleasurable fact of consciousness, is involved in mystery. It came, we know not whence or why. “It appeared,” as has been said, “on the theatre of man's consciousness; he found it pleasant, and was thus encouraged to develop it further.” It indeed is a most remarkable and noteworthy fact, which we later shall have to dwell upon, that our loftiest aspirations have the meanest beginnings, and have started from the lowest motives.

Buckle has insisted that there can be no evolution in morality, since moral truths are always the same. “Do good to others, love

thy neighbour as thyself; forgive thy enemies; subdue thy passions; honour thy parents"—these and the like, he says, are all the essential moral precepts, and not an iota has been added to them since time immemorial. This, at most, is true only of the intellectual side of morality; but, as we have seen, it is our feelings, our passions, that drive the social train for weal or woe; our passions it is that are the horses, so to speak—and often very unruly horses—while the intellect, at most, directs like the coachman. Now, we may admit, that there has been no improvement in our practice of duty or justice; that there has, perhaps, actually been a decline as the bitter fruit of the prevailing individualism; at the same time we can point to the fact that the undercurrent has led us up on hitherto unknown heights of sympathy. Again, to enlighten the intellect, to improve what I have called the "atmosphere" of Morality, changes the quality of Morality itself. To discover what is our true destiny, to get the conviction, that a benevolent power has outlined the road for us, that we can progress only by becoming its willing co-operators, and that the "ought to do" and "ought to be" in us mean that the ideal sometime "will be," must necessarily change a weak, vague sentiment into an active conscious force. Is not that evolution?

And will not this be the greatest evolution of all, when Socialism will give us convincing reasons for distinguishing between the two forms of Personal Ethics—a distinction as wide apart as heaven is from hell? The one, purity, temperance, and honour, without sacrifice, cultivated simply to become better than others, to hold aloof from common humanity, will be clearly seen to be worthless and worse: a ministration of death, exclusively; but the same personal morality, if in the service of the affections, to be most sacred, and a prerequisite to all true morality, for it is our personal affections that give aim and direction to our social sentiments.

Such self-love is the fountain from which the wider forms of human affections flow and on which philanthropy itself is ultimately based. Self is "the chalice that holds the sacramental wine; thus we must take care that this chalice be not soiled or leaky, that the wine be not defiled or wasted," and, therefore, purity, temperance and honour are indispensable to the social self.

When we are bidden to "love our neighbours as *ourselves*," we have before us a sublime precept which embodies the deepest truth. We must in the first place cherish our own life, for otherwise we could not "live for others;" we must make ourselves pure, since my own life must be precious to me before I can attach much preciousness to the life of others; I must make myself valuable, for if myself is paltry, so is every other self, so are all our selves put together. "If the talk of each man is senseless babble, the united babbling of a million men may out-thunder one, but will be no more sensible." *Self-engrossment*, in other words, narrows "self," wars against love and sympathy, and is immoral. *Self-respect*, character, precisely because it has a tendency to expand "self," is the very foundation for morality, without which, as we shall see later on, even self-sacrifice is simply moral suicide.

Here individualism, the established order, shows itself in its most satanic form, as the maelstrom that swallows up purity, temperance, and honour. I charge it with being the foe of honour, the foe of temperance, and the foe of purity. The Church knows this very well, and therefore places the "world" (as she calls it) on a line with the devil.

As to honour. Evidently, if our social order absolutely tempts away from honesty, it must be equally inimical to its refinement: honour. Why, it is the monstrous fact that a refined man, if he be poor, cannot possibly be perfectly honourable, since, in order to satisfy his mere physical needs, he *must* stoop to gain the favour of some other man, and to advance that man's private interests. Of course, what struggle this involves they never know to whom the regular eating of costly food comes just as easy and natural as breathing. And how incomparably worse is the corresponding position of a woman! How difficult it is for the poor girl to keep her "honour" the wealthy lady can never comprehend. Lecky says,¹ "statistics of prostitution show that the great proportion of those who have fallen into it have been impelled by the most extreme poverty, in many instances verging upon starvation." I am confident that it is fully as bad in our country. Should not the scandalous fact that honour is placed in one scale and starva-

¹In *European Morals*.

tion in the other, nerve us with sufficient energy to change such a social order?

As to temperance. It is a great pity that those persevering and noble men, the Prohibitionists, will not open their eyes to the palpable fact that intemperance in liquors is much more an effect than a cause; that it is our competition, and especially our insecurity that lure a man on to drinking, and then to excessive drinking. I must say I feel myself strongly drawn towards them on account of their perseverance, their unselfishness, and especially the social spirit that animates them. I mean by this that it is the elevation of the whole society rather than individual improvement which they, with untiring zeal, seek to accomplish, and that makes them, it seems to me, a most desirable sort of allies. While, then, it would be suicidal, I grant, for Socialists to join the Prohibition party, I hold, on the other hand, that they should make very great efforts to win the sympathy and co-operation of Prohibitionists and other so-called temperance men, even be willing for that purpose to make personal sacrifices, "to submit to restrictions lest offence be given." I, for my part, who enjoy as much as anyone a glass of beer or punch of an evening, am perfectly ready and willing to do without it for the rest of my life if these men would second my efforts.

As to sexual purity, I should say that this social order is about as unclean as Rome in its decline ever was. We have a glaring illustration of it in the drama of Renan—the representative of modern culture—entitled, *L'Abbesse de Jouarre*. The hero and heroine, having known each other as children, meet in one of the prisons of the first French revolution, both convinced that they will be guillotined together the following morning. He persuades her, the nun, to submit herself then and there to his embraces. He dies as they expected; she escapes, and in due time gives birth to a child. The following extract from the preface shows the extraordinary view which the drama is intended to illustrate: "The hour of death is the most sincere of all; one is in the presence of the Infinite. If anything in that hour should assume the character of absolute sincerity it is love. I often imagine that if mankind should acquire the certainty that the world were about to end

in two or three days, *love would break forth on all sides with a sort of frenzy*, for that which restrains love is the absolutely necessary conditions which the moral conservation of human society has imposed. If one should see oneself in the face of a sudden and certain death, nature alone would speak; the most powerful of its instincts would resume its rights; a cry would escape from every breast when it would be known that one might approach, with entire legitimacy, the tree surrounded with so many anathemas. The security of conscience, founded upon the assurance that love would not have any morrow, would produce sentiments, condensing infinity into a few hours—sensations to which one would abandon oneself without fear of exhausting the source of life. *The world would drain to the dregs, and without afterthought, a powerful aphrodisiac which would make it die of delight (!).* The last breath would be a kiss of sympathy, sent to the universe, perhaps to something beyond (*sic.*). One would die with a sentiment of the highest adoration—*in the act the most perfect (!)*." He then repeats the old libel on the Christian martyrs: "The last night spent together in prison gave rise to scenes of which the rigorists disapproved; these funereal embraces were the consequences of a tragic situation and of the happiness experienced by men and women united to die together for the same cause." Lastly, after the embrace, the nun exclaims, "Thou hast made me more Christian than I was before" (!).

We may infer from Renan's position that the above is a truthful picture of the sexual ideal of the ruling classes of France: that "love" in their mouths means *lust*.

But my readers will probably add, "that is a very sad state of French society; but no Anglo-Saxon, surely, would in the face of death have such thoughts? It is of God, the future life, and the souls of his dear ones he would think. Even our depraved characters certain death would instantly sober. What Renan says will not apply to Anglo-Saxon human nature, whatever it may do to the French."

Ah! I fully agree that the above extract does not describe either Anglo-Saxon nor French human nature with the majority; but I do believe that it paints the sexual impurity of our ruling

classes as well as the French, and of the ruling classes everywhere, under our individualistic order of things—only the French are frank, and the others are hypocrites. Unfortunately, there are altogether too many men among us of our comfortable classes who in their hearts say with the hero of Théophile Gautier, “I see nothing shocking in a young girl selling herself.” Our prostitution that cries to heaven proves it. And is it not horribly significant that a moral teacher like Sidgwick writes in his *Method of Ethics*—a book for students—in regard to a plea for legalising it and setting apart these unfortunate women from society, these infamous words: “This view has, perhaps, a superficial plausibility, for *continence certainly involves a considerable loss of pleasure (sic !)*”

Cannot Prohibitionists see that such a cancer, penetrating the whole social system, is a far greater danger than even such a disgusting ulcer as intemperance? And should not all moral men bless the advent of Socialism if it can tear it out by the roots?

31. Look at the mournful procession of women of the town, thus created by our wicked social order, both by pushing the woman toward the pit by her small pay under the wage-system, and by having her tempted by the incontinent vagabonds from our middle classes, which this social order keeps unmarried.

In our large manufacturing cities and villages great numbers of operatives of both sexes—more than half of them young women—are gathered together. Here they are thrown in each others' company rather rudely in their work; the boarding houses where most of them spend their nights and Sundays afford them none of the restraints of home; their evenings are wont to find them in the streets and cheap places of amusement. The wages of these operatives, especially of the females, are ludicrously small. They must pay out of it for board and room, washing and clothing. What a pinching life this must be! The moral fruits of this herding together and exposure to strong temptation are a very poor outfit for a happy married life. Most of the present deterioration of family life is due to these industrial conditions, and to the necessary flitting of the operatives from place to place.

The relation of the sexes is certainly the deepest root of human

well-being; it is therefore no wonder that women call a chaste man "moral," though of course it is an almost ridiculously narrow and selfish view of things. It is by the avenue of sexual love that man comes forth from his mere personality and learns to live in another, while obeying his most powerful instincts. If a man cannot love, it is looked upon as a moral misfortune, if not as a moral fault; for a man's absence of a beloved form is the finest thing in life missed: he grows selfish, heartless, materialised—this is not a good state for him nor a natural one for society. Instinctively we think of Rome in the age of Augustus. On the other hand, when he does love successfully, it is held that his whole nature has burst out into blossom. That woman's nature—perhaps with some few exceptions—is to love is admitted on all hands.

The chastity of a nation, from any point you look at it, intimately depends upon the fact, that *the men marry when young*. Nothing is more natural, in our present social order, than to look upon marriage without sufficient means of subsistence with horror; or when one's standing in society, or the prospects of children are threatened. Hence a constantly increasing disinclination of men to marry, and the necessary consequence is our frightful prostitution that places us in a more degraded state than that of the cities of the plain. Appetites and passions never exert a controlling and therefore a degrading influence, until they have been rendered fierce by some foolish asceticism or accidental starvation. But as has been said, "reduce the appetites to a famished condition, imprison them as you do a tiger, and of course you infuse into them a tiger's force and ferocity." Normally the natural appetites and passions are a solace and a refreshment to our mental faculties rather than a burden; and normally sexual passions are a source of divine unity and of heavenly innocence and tenderness. The first healthy influence Socialism will have on sexual love is, that it will enable every loving couple *to marry young*.

Next, Socialism, by conferring upon woman the *power* of earning her own living at pleasure by *suitable* work, will enable her to refuse to marry for a home or for maintenance. There is a loud complaint of the frequency of divorce, but this is simply the effect

of something else. Happily married people do not seek divorce. The trouble is, that the preceding marriage ought never to have been entered into. Unfortunately, our economic system, mark! turns marriage into a commercial institution. Young women form a matrimonial market regulated by demand and supply, and enter into matrimony to gain a support. What our law allows to be marriage is often a very nasty thing. It is not I, but Henry James, sen., who says, "the law of every so-called Christian country permits one to sell his daughter—if but the clergy gild the transaction—to any unclean wretch whose pecuniary reputation is good. What an annual sacrifice is, in consequence, offered up by Christendom to the merciless moloch of our civilisation! What a sacrifice of myriads of innocent young ones! What sort of purity follows? Let our popular newspapers answer, with hints to clandestine commerce, with enigmatic notifications of adulterous meetings and advertisements of abortionists." Our conventional legal marriage, instead of being a means for the highest possible humanisation of the parties, becomes a hopeless degradation.

Socialism, lastly, will greatly elevate the marriage institution itself.

Roman marriage differed from the Greek; Catholic marriage, again, differed radically from the former; these modifications have not come to an end, and all preceding modifications will progressively develop the future.

Marriage is a great end in itself, but is still more important as the grand avenue that leads to the organic unity of all men. The former is the highest possible humanisation of the parties; but much more ought we to look upon the domestic life as the miniature of and school for our social life; the filial relation as the source of reverence for ancestry and sympathy with the historic past; the parental as throwing a like enthusiasm into the future; the fraternal as the practising ground for all reciprocal social sentiments.

Marriage must be elevated from its present degraded state, where it is popularly believed that only the legal sanctions keep it in honour, and that it is destitute of internal bonds. Yet its bonds are the strongest possible: chaste passion and the most

profound friendship. To give these free play we must leave the institution more in woman's keeping and less in man's, make her most answerable for its honour who is most interested in its stability. This, again, is accomplished by Socialism, by investing the wife with the *potentiality* of economic independence of her husband, to be realised every time she sees fit.

First, then, just as it is in the animal world, the female sex should control the male in all matters pertaining to sex, declining and successfully rejecting the advances of the male, when not reciprocated. Unfortunately, remarks Lester F. Ward, "woman has lost her sceptre and surrendered herself to his control, instead of, as she should, ruling him by reason of his passion and the favour which she alone can confer." Love abhors nothing more than the license which even our best conventional conjugality permits. Yet it is true that satisfied affection means aversion; affection in proportion to its tenderness seeks a perpetual gratification, that is, desires to be unsatisfied. Its very life consists in seeking and never accomplishing.

When woman has resumed her sceptre, then, what is very important, the pastimes, recreations, and pleasures will be shared by both; the present separate spheres of recreation tend to render desire for association with each other prurient.

Secondly, marriage ought to be in its essence an interior *friendship*, a profound bosom fellowship between man and woman. No other association can be so intimate as this which causes a complete fusion of two natures in one. It ought to be, but, alas! how rarely it is! It is precisely the absence of this friendship that makes marriage now a failure, in the many cases where everything else conspires to make it a happy relation. The husband really holds his young wife dear, but his love is at bottom nothing but admiration for her various charms, and no sooner does he find her person legally made over to him than this admiration dies out. He should associate her in his affairs, his ideas, his aspirations; make her co-operate, in her sphere, with him in his; their natures are precisely constituted for that purpose: he is a master in specialties, she has aptness for general ideas.

To will, to think, to enjoy, to suffer together—that would be true marriage! But, unfortunately, as yet she *cannot* be his friend. She has not been educated and trained for that. It is the socialist commonwealth that will train her properly.

32. Reflect once on this, that love of their own children is something our wage-workers must look upon as a luxury in which they cannot indulge. They are toiling from morning till night, and are then so tired that they must seek rest, so the only time they can hear their children's prattle or romp with them is Sunday. But there is far worse to be told. The horrible fact is, that these children of theirs, as soon as they can find their way in the streets, must become bread-winners. These miserable parents, as we saw, cannot make both ends meet without the labour of their children, and consequently, in Massachusetts, where a few weeks' schooling is required by law, the parents are compelled—mark that, ye rich, with hearts in your bosoms!—to evade the law by false swearing in regard to their children's age. Again, as a consequence, small fellows are sent into the world as newsboys and bootblacks at an age when the sons of the rich are still in the nursery.

Again, schooling of nearly all children stops when their faculty of thinking commences to be active. They are positively robbed of the years during which *character* is formed.

Socialism will radically revolutionise all this: it will relieve all children from being bread-winners; it will place them all from their tender years *till they reach adult age* in the charge and under the eye of educators, and see that they are properly fed, clothed, and lodged during this whole period. That will mark the advent of the social *régime* and of the conscious evolution of society. As already observed, in spite of the marked improvement in all respects that will immediately take place, too much must not be expected of the generation that effects the change: the full fruits will be gathered by that one which will have enjoyed a socialist training. And, again, society will not become self-conscious before the material conditions of abundance, freedom, and leisure will have been secured.

The changed method and subjects of education will be of no less importance. "Mercantilism" insensibly pervades our schools, our school-books, the tradition and methods of teaching, so that our training largely ministers to our respect for trade. Manual training will, in addition to the important effects already noted, be an excellent means for securing discipline. Just at the age when boys are apt to be most restless and insubordinate, a little manual work affords vent to their surplus energies, and proves a most valuable aid in maintaining discipline.

Since, fortunately, already a considerable interest has been awakened in manual instruction (though, of course, it is far from being looked upon in the spirit with which Socialism will invest it), it should be of interest to learn how a pioneer school in Paris of that kind looks, connected with the elementary classes. Here is a description :

The wood-shop is the largest—for school purposes wood-working is the most conducive to the elementary training of the hand. There are twelve carpenters' benches in two rows in the middle of the room, each for two boys, working at the same time; and along the wall, near the windows, four turning lathes are placed, each worked by three boys; each boy is employed fifteen minutes at turning, while the others look on. The tools employed are the different kind of planes, saws, chisels, etc. The pupils make boxes and small chairs, and are taught to make the different joints, dovetailing, some turning out really creditable work. At the lathe they turn a plain stick into as many as seventy-six different ornamental pieces. The workshop for iron contains twelve vices, and is further provided with a boring machine, an anvil, and a forge. For forging and hammering lead is used, as it demands less muscular force than iron. It has already been noted, but cannot be repeated too often, that the experience is in all the Paris manual-working schools (of which a few years ago there were no less than 285), that the boys are dissatisfied that they cannot spend more time in them, and are rejoiced at being permitted to spend their free time over their work.

We come now to one of the most deplorable defects in our American civilisation, and here Socialism will confer one of its

greatest blessings. The disobedience and rudeness of American children to parents and to adults is patent and flagrant; it is the most common experience of men and women in American cities to be insulted by half-grown boys, especially when they are in groups, where, thus, their love of approbation turns them into ruffians.

Socialism will instil obedience into the minds of all our children. It is, as Prof. Fiske has pointed out, to infancy, and especially to its being lengthened to extend over an increasing number of years, that man owes his physical progress, family, society, and moral ideas. If there is anything that all men agree upon in theory, it is that this period ought to be passed in submission to others, because during it the most durable, and, beyond all comparison, most important impressions are made on the plastic mind. It is acknowledged here, at least, that restraint is a blessing, a requisite to develop the maximum of power. If children were made the equals of adults, the result would be infinitely worse than barbarism; it would be an unimaginable degree of cruelty to the young. It was Franklin who observed that the Chinese, who have a knack of turning everything upside down, have here, at all events, hit on the right relation by making the honours granted to a social benefactor *ascend* to his ancestry instead of to his posterity.

One of the greatest blessings of the new social order will be, that children will then find in their teachers helpful friends to assist and guide them through the terribly dangerous period of puberty, when the passions and imagination run riot. The systematic ignorance now maintained on the most sacred things is most disastrous to our girls especially.

But Socialism will do more than relieve children from being bread-winners and discipline them. There is no doubt that it was, until lately, the universal American idea, as it was, up to 1870, the universal British idea, that parents ought to have full control over their children. Probably few Americans ever reflected that this was a relic of the ancient claim of parents to abandon and kill their children if they saw fit. Undoubtedly, the old conviction was a correct one, that it was safer to invest command over children in even the worst parents than to leave such control entirely unprovided for.

The State has, in the course of evolution, more and more contested that claim by forbidding the killing and abandonment of children, and most decidedly by establishing the age of majority when parental authority entirely ceases. Now we are approaching the time when society will take upon itself the entire school education of children, and it is interesting to note how almost year by year the American mind progresses in this respect. You almost can see the growth.

Not to speak of the cases when parents neglect their responsibilities, and when it is fully admitted, that it is a moral crime against the child for the State not to interfere and provide instructive and mental training for it, it is really a contest between family selfishness and the spirit of modern democracy protesting against it. Family exclusiveness, often a mere veil for personal selfishness, a sort of aggregate selfishness, is now practically the chief obstacle to the full evolution of our human social nature, and is destined to be broken down. The family in our country, to be sure, does not consciously antagonise the social spirit in humanity but it is still a very rancorous and deep-seated prejudice, which profoundly colours our practical ethics. Ah, how often are not "nice" children taught by their parents to shun ragged children, making the latter feel themselves outcasts, as one of the "proprieties" that later in life develop into tragedies. This division into two "camps" is a miserably anti-social one, which fortunately often is being broken down by the child, who feels the family bond irksome, and finds its most precious enjoyments and friendships outside the home precincts.

Under the socialist régime, it will be acknowledged that the education of children is of far more concern and importance to society than to parents. By the parent the child will be considered a *trust*, held in the service of humanity, and its rearing the establishment of an essentially organic relation, which thereby will be ennobled far beyond the scope of the most tender personal passion; and filial affection, when the future station of the child will be determined by its capacity, and not by the accident of being born in a certain class, will become an almost ideal sentiment.

No wonder that noble men, like Lester F. Ward and the author

of *God in His World*, think, that if but for a generation the hearts of fathers would be turned towards our children, the nation would be regenerated; but before the chapter closes we shall be convinced, I hope, that more would be required: that Socialism will first have to be acknowledged in principle throughout our industrial system.

33. Our domestic service is one of the most vicious and immoral of relations under the present social order. If a modern servant misconducts himself he is turned out on the spot and another hired as easily as you would call a cab. To refuse him a character may be equivalent to sentencing him to months of suffering; yet it is continually inflicted, without appeal, reflection, or the smallest disturbance of the smooth surface of ordinary life.

One of our more respectable Boston newspapers lately called attention to the fact, that thousands of girls in every large city work on ready-made clothing for the wretchedly low average wages of 3 dols. a week; that ten hours a day on foot-power sewing machines is so trying as to speedily undermine the physical constitution, and that there are yet many more applicants than can possibly be employed. That, on the other hand, the demand for women for domestic service is far greater than the supply, and goes on moralising: "of course household service involves a certain sense of personal degradation, besides placing displeasing checks on freedom of action, but it seems to us that the sewing girl pays very dearly for her privileges; the distinction is largely a sentimental one."

Indeed it is, but we ought to feel very glad and hopeful at the fact that sentiment has such a power over American women, and applaud them for it—that shows them to be of royal kin, and places them high above their rich sisters who shamelessly ape foreign class pretensions, even down to decorating their imported "servants" and "footmen" with imported liveries, corrupting us from our original democratic simplicity. This disinclination by women to serve, and be liable to be called to account for every hour of their life, is in obedience to the growing access of the social sentiment: that man is destined for the broadest conceivable

unity with his kind. This puerile social *régime*, with its division into free and servile, constantly exerts a debasing influence upon our hearts and minds and keeps us strangers to each other. "Servants," into which our older word "help" has sunk, are the citadel of this *régime* and blight every effort and aspiration towards race-harmony.

There is one respect, though, in which we here still have an immense advantage over Europe, and it is not likely that we shall lose it in the main, now that the socialist spirit has commenced to take such a hold on our people. We, the people of these United States, do at bottom constitute, and have, ever since our Declaration of Independence, constituted a brotherhood, and the sentiment has become inbred into the marrow of our bones in spite of all corruption and swindling, which after all float only on the surface. But the European cities, especially, are really divided into two classes of men, set apart by a deep chasm, to wit: gentlemen, properly clothed, who are expected on all occasions to give tips, and the rest of the population who, for the smallest service rendered, expect tips. This abominable system of tipping is a great stumbling-block to the growth of a true socialistic sentiment. The greatest obstacle I see in Great Britain to the growth of Socialism is the snobbishness that obtains there; that reverence is there inculcated for rank and title. There are, however, various facts tending to prove that it is the middle classes, *not* the working classes, that are guilty of this snobbishness. It is fortunate that, in our country, a stupid millionaire may look down, but that we, in general, do not *look up*! It, however, looks bad to see a prominent editor speak of a sense of personal degradation as "mere sentiment." He who, however honourable, does not blush on looking at a lackey or footman, is a servile mind.

Under Socialism we undoubtedly shall not be without "helpers" in our private houses—those in the public establishments will, of course, be just as much public functionaries as the guests who have their wants attended to. But the relations of these private attendants to their principals will be very different from what it is now—it will be a sympathetic, not a pecuniary one. These attendants will attach themselves to our persons because attracted

by our personal qualities, and on the condition of being incorporated into our families as members thereof—something like the pages of mediæval households; they will hardly accept such positions on other terms. When all enjoy the same high and thorough education, we can have disinterested, respected service—then all will admit that the service is not performed because they cannot do better things.

34. All the preceding steps lead up to what must be looked upon as the centre of this essay—*Sympathy*: the essence of love, as love is the kernel of morality. Sympathy is the alpha and omega of morality; without sympathy there is absolutely no morality, and by itself sympathy may almost be said to constitute morality. That is so much so that even conjugal love and parental love, however precious in themselves, may be considered essentially as the most potent means for the evolution of sympathy.

This does not imply any gushing sentimentality for men indiscriminately. With Sir James Stephen I never forget that there are a great many unlovely and many wicked men in the world, and that it is a part of virile morality to meet them with the reverse of affection. I even can sympathise with his contempt for the sentimentalist:—"Do not daub me with your love, sir!" By sympathy I mean that to which indifference is the antithesis. We are each other's keepers, must feel ourselves belonging to a moral universe. Every instance of sympathy is an intuition of race-consciousness: a proof that we are indissolubly linked together. That does not prevent there being a conflict to the death between the good man and the scoundrel—rather the reverse. I sometimes fervently wish I were a spirit strong enough to take the stock gambler or millionaire whose selfishness is hidden under the flowing drapery of piety and suspend him as high as the Eiffel Tower to scare him, if possible, into brotherhood!

Sympathy is truly the alpha and omega of morality—its commencement and its end. In the first place, it is the original moral force, the mutual attraction which men experienced in the very

beginning. On the day when man combined—or rather was driven by his inward force to combine—with his fellows into a society, he turned his back on Nature, and laid the foundation of a new kingdom, that of sympathy; he broke the ban of Nature which lays down as its law self-seeking, the struggle for existence, though our “advanced” philosophers are blind to it. As a force it grew more and more, sometimes from the lowest and most selfish motives; thus it is a fact that the practice of killing infants lasted longer than the doing away with the aged, simply because infancy was past and old age was awaiting all. Now we have developed it so far that we generally cannot get along without it; that even they who outrage it in its most vital part find they cannot do without it—witness the men who betray a trust in order to secure a fortune, do they not, when they get away securely, and reach, say Canada, spend a great portion to secure new prestige, applause, and other companionship of human beings precisely similar to those they have ruined? And whenever we here and there find a man, a selfish philosopher, who entirely cuts himself off from human sympathy for the purpose of living a merely “cultured” life, cannot we always detect in him that he has thereby become something less than a man, that he has missed the full fruition of life?

But sympathy is quite a complex phenomenon. There is no feeling so intimately connected with intellect as it is. It will be remembered that morality was compared to a plant in a hothouse whose growth depends on the condition of the glass through which comes the sunshine. Well, Intellect is to sympathy what the glass is to the plant. Sympathy cannot arise until vivid mental representations can be made of the state of suffering in others, based upon the experience by each individual of like sufferings in himself. This is the psychological analysis of the golden rule: “Do to others what ye wish they should do unto you,” of our great moral teachers.

This will prove a very helpful suggestion. It will make us understand that where we now find, or found in olden times, defect of sympathy, it is and was simply an intellectual defect; it was nothing else than insensibility; wherever we read of instances

of revolting cruelty, it was simply intellectual torpor. Our sensibility is quickened by the same power that implies intellectual progress. As the reasoning faculties become quicker and wider, and the power of observing relations between human beings increases, there is an increase in feeling of humanity, if in nothing else. However licentious, or selfish, then, we may have become, we are fortunately yet more reluctant to inflict pain. The sympathetic man has advanced, having acquired new sensibilities; he is not the same man acting from different motives, but he is a different being with a different set of faculties; and now he cannot develop in the future as a reasonable agent without it.

We have a most instructive and hopeful example of it in our own race. Even but a short century ago mercy by the populace of England to humble offenders of their own class was unknown: a shower of brickbats or rotten eggs on the wretches in the pillory was a very common act; hooting the miserable man, tied to a cart's tail, they used to implore the hangman to drive fast to "make him howl." What a remarkable change has now come over the same class, simply on account of a little better treatment of them and a little more instruction! For now it is a common observation that a crowd of the lowest people applaud the chastisement of a ruffian who has maltreated a child. One more suggestive example—if not an instance of sympathy, at least of a sense of solidarity: A short time ago when a vast procession was going to pass along the Thames embankment in London, they wanted to try an experiment, and so they attached a tag to each of the young noble trees along that thoroughfare, inscribed, "These trees are public property;" and though a crowd was present, as hardly ever before, not one of these trees was in the least injured!

To learn what influence Socialism will have on sympathy we must distinguish between three sorts of sympathy: with pain, with pleasure, and with the thought and purposes of others. I wish to emphasise the fact, that this is a most important division. The first of these, sympathy with pain, is so far the principal one; that is the kind first known, and the one with which we hitherto have been most familiar. "Rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep." On first view one would suppose

it easier to fulfil the former of these commandments than the latter. Yet this is a mistake. It is in our days much easier for us to weep than rejoice with others. When we witness pain we ourselves feel involuntarily pain and have an impulse to alleviate the pain of the sufferer, just as surely as we do when we experience a blow. Indeed, the word "compassion" has now-a-days come to mean sympathy with suffering, and the word "sympathy" itself is rapidly following in the same direction. But we do not like to weep, and there is altogether too much suffering in the world—this is sufficient to check the growth of that sort of sympathy.

It is almost self-evident that sympathy with pleasure has a much more promising future. It is pleasant, ordinarily, to feel that sympathy, and simultaneously we heighten the enjoyment of the person sympathised with; but, unfortunately, too frequently we are prevented from thus rejoicing with others by those other facts of envy, jealousy, and other forms of ill-will. Is it necessary to subscribe to the terrible doctrine of Bain, that "malevolence is intrinsically one of our intensest pleasures?" Is a cat "malevolent" which plays with a mouse? And so we can conceive that men are malevolent who simply are so undeveloped that they cannot realise the feelings of their victims. Anger, resentment, hatred, envy, instinctive dislike of every kind, are, of course, facts, but there is this fundamental distinction, that the fact, *Sympathy*, is instinctive, while the other fact, *Ill-Will*, is *always occasioned*. The truth is the very opposite of what Mallock affirms, that "Virtue constantly runs counter to our natural impulses."

And how occasioned? Ah, here it is that the Established Order is most at fault, where it most seems animated by the very spirit of Satan: all the motives furnished by present society systematically discourage sympathy and create ill-will, which nearly all can be explained by, and traced to, the contravention of social economic laws. How often is it not the case that loving natures become poisoned by their life-experience? Proud natures like, for instance, Dean Swift, become converted into universal gall and at last come to feel hatred for their species. Dislike, and not uncommonly contempt for human nature, is developed in our contact with our fellows by the scorching probation of life, and by the terrible battle

for existence in which the contemptible and ignorant survive and succeed. Truly, as there is a holy anger and righteous indignation, so, I affirm, there is a *holy envy* and *righteous jealousy* in the breast of the able, the talented, the industrious on seeing the prosperity of our vulgar fortune-hunters.

And bearing in mind the powerful and persistent temptations of the world, and above all else, that the wicked anti-social doctrine of the struggle for existence is inculcated by our moral teachers, is it not astounding that men have grown so sympathetic? To me the fact that *the majority, under the circumstances, are so good*, and the bad not worse than they are, would be a standing miracle, but for the Order in the Cosmos.

Now, is it not easy to see that under Socialism, on the contrary, sympathy with pleasure will vastly increase? Even Spencer, with his puerile notion of society as a crowd of independent monads, sees how sympathy will increase "as the moulding and remoulding of man and society into mutual fitness progresses," and this portion is decidedly the most worthy of study of his whole *Data of Ethics*.

He calls attention to the deeper and wider sympathy that will arise from the agencies which excite it becoming more efficient; that is to say, the emotional language of facial changes and tones of voice will become more copious and the perception of these signs more delicate, and the imagination strengthened, thus identifying the feelings of the sympathiser and the person sympathised with. Next, as pains decrease and pleasures increase, sympathy will come more and more to mean gratification by participation in others' consciousness of enjoyment, and such is the blessed ordering of things that one's enjoyment is not lessened, but on the contrary is strengthened by the simultaneous enjoyment of others. "Each will have in other persons supplementary eyes and ears, warding off evils they cannot perceive for themselves." "Eventually sympathetic pleasures will be spontaneously pursued to the fullest extent."

Under Socialism, when ability and skill will naturally gravitate towards all positions of influence, and everybody be aware of the fact and applaud, we most likely shall have to coin some such

word as "*congaudence*," to express our sympathy with others' joy, corresponding to "compassion." In fact, I am confident that the masses then will look upon private luxury with far different feelings than now, with approval and applause, for it will be the worthy who will enjoy it, especially the retired heroes and servants of humanity.

Again, when, under Socialism, the chasm now dividing the classes is filled, then we shall have everywhere the sympathy, greater than that with pain, greater than that with pleasure: sympathy with the thoughts and purposes of others—*friendship*. Friendship is the *bouquet* of morality—the distilled flavour of morality; the important link that will make sexual love evolve love for fellow-men. The future moralised society will be constituted of groups of friends, each group formed out of men and women from various callings and departments. We know very little of true friendship now, and it is again the Established Order that is at fault, which is the cause of the fact that we have only cliques. Friendship, being sympathy with thoughts and purposes, of course, demands community of sentiments, but it is equally a law that true friendships are formed out of diversities of character—such diversities as are found in people of various callings. It is this diversity that creates admiration. We should thus expect model friendships between literary men and working-men; but they are at present separated by a yawning chasm. We have therefore now comradeships where the mutual influence is by no means always salutary, while true friendships, with their mutual confidences, always have the moral advantage of conferring personal dignity on the parties. Our hearts are sealed books to all but friends. I like to consider as an ideal friendship the relation of Jesus and John, the latter reclining on his master's bosom, sharing his aspirations and being the only one who follows him to the cross.

Ah, it is true friendships that are needed at this hour, when good men are separated in two camps—Socialists who distrust religion in one camp, and in the other religious minds repelled by Socialism which they misunderstand.

At last, however, we have to consider sympathy in its most important form, in its greatest development. It is not alone the

original moral force, but it will become the very end of morality. Sympathy as *the organic unity of men*—this is morality as its own end. Socialism will carry morality to its greatest pitch by bringing into the consciousness of the citizens of the co-operative commonwealth the doctrine of their organic unity, and by extending the doctrine gradually but surely over every department of human life, as an organic power—with all the momentous consequences it involves. We can imagine how, immediately with the advent of Socialism, each citizen will feel the common life pulsating in his individual veins, and become consciously aware of himself as a member of this glorious social commonwealth, with one impulse thrilling through every fibre of the people. Then will be resurrected the intense feeling of *corporate responsibility* which pervaded all the life of ancient society, and the individual no longer depreciated but ennobled beyond all previous conception. Then in a glow of enthusiasm a generation of sustained and rightly guided effort may be inaugurated and will convert this world into a paradise of brothers, drawing the bands of society as closely together as those of a family. Yes, the organic unity of all men is a solemn truth, so much so, indeed, that the inhuman wretch who in cold blood hacked his brother to pieces and severed his head for the sake of gain is—*your* brother, do I say? is a part of your inmost being, and you will never have peace to all eternity till he is elevated to your own plane.

However, the thoughts about Organic Unity will have to be completed in Chap. VI.

It was a glorious vision of Jesus to discern the organic unity of man. For unless there is a *real identity* in man, the “Inasmuch as ye did it to the least of these ye did it unto me” becomes an absurdity. No one has been heard of who, owing a debt to one man, thought he could pay it to another man who merely was *like* the first, no matter how like.

35. The conclusion of the preceding section, that *the organic unity of man is the end of morality*, is, I think, the most important outcome of ethical speculations; yet this is only one aspect of the moral end, the objective; the other, the subjective aspect, is

equally important, and this is *self-sacrifice*, always looked upon as the crown of morals. Yet Herbert Spencer overlooks this entirely, for what he calls "self-sacrifice" is nothing but the common social amenities of life. Real self-sacrifice is risking, and, if need be, deliberately sacrificing all that we hold dear in this life, our liberty and personal existence, for a great object. This is humanity in its perfection, to all healthy minds jewelled specimens, strewn like diamonds throughout time and space.

But there is an objection that comes here very natural, which Sir James Stephen has put in these words: "I do not believe that any man ever did, or ever will, as long as men are men, intentionally perform an act of absolute self-sacrifice, *i.e.*, hurt himself without any reason for doing so."

This is an objection well taken. We must make self-sacrifice reasonable, and *we can make it reasonable*. The *datum* of the "social" and the "personal self" will help us out and show us that self-sacrifice is at the same time *self-realisation*, that is to say, it is sacrifice of the private and realisation of the social "self." The two are absolutely identical—a fact of immense practical importance. Just as much as we insisted that personal morality without sacrifice is worthless, is pharisaism, so it should never be forgotten that self-sacrifice, without self-realisation, that is without personal morality, is moral suicide. We have some very striking examples of this in the world. This is precisely the quality lacking in the Nihilists. They have shown themselves heroic, brave, self-sacrificing and devoted to their cause; but because they clearly considered their own selves of no value, despised existence, all sound hearts instinctively feel that their heroism is lacking in moral value.

And history presents us another great instance. I have elsewhere shown, in my "*Ca Ira, or Danton in the French Revolution*," from manuscripts collected in France during the last 25 years, that Danton, far from being the ruffian he has been depicted, was the very best embodiment of the progressive spirit of the revolution, and the only man capable of rendering Napoleon impossible and unnecessary. It is his misfortune that he frequently has been misconstrued, as when he exclaimed: "May my name be

blasted, if but France be free!" This, if "name" stands for mere *reputation*, was a grand exclamation, but if it means *character*, as his critics have interpreted it, it would, precisely for the reason above stated, be a highly immoral saying. No man has a right, for even the noblest of objects, to sacrifice one's character, one's true self.

Here the Established Order, individualism, shows itself in its meanest shape. It cannot do away with the fact that numbers of men and women are capable of acts of unalloyed self-sacrifice in which there is not a vestige of afterthought tending to self-advantage. We have had in our age the rough miner bidding his mate seize the one chance of escape up the shaft, since the latter is a husband and father; the surgeon sucking diphtheria poison from a dying child's throat, and dying himself; and perhaps the most notable of all, the gambler, the true child of the age, sacrificing his life at the fire of the Southern Hotel in St. Louis to save the servant girls. Evolution proclaims the certainty that such cases are becoming less and less exceptional. This capacity for sacrifice regardless of self has been evolving in the long travail of the world, and has prospects of vastly greater increase, as its supreme beauty and price are being perceived and valued. But our individualism does all that it can do to depreciate it: it inculcates that *the martyr is nothing but a fool*.

Socialism, with its doctrine of the organic unity of man, will surely put a supreme value on self-sacrifice. Look at Humboldt and those who have conducted researches about the North pole. Their motives were not want nor avarice, nor even ambition; their ruling motives can have been little less than their love of knowledge and the ennobling pleasures which attend the purest exercise of the intellectual faculties. They furnished instances of self-sacrifices which undoubtedly will be vastly increased by Socialism. But something is yet wanting. Why is this "organic unity of man" an object of such supreme importance? It is easy enough to see that I ought to realise my social self, because the social organism, humanity, is a system of selves, of whose essence myself is an integral part. But why is humanity so supremely valuable?

Undoubtedly the whole becomes lovely and sacred because of

its better parts, because in the general mass of dull and heavy earth there are grains of gold. We love mankind because great and good men have in very truth loved it, and lived and laboured and died for it; we love it in the persons of these men. They and that noble band, select company who now do their duty and more, and speak not of it and almost know not of it—they make humanity lovely in our eyes. Underneath many unhand-some exteriors there lie unsuspected such capacities for disinterested action, jubilant self-abandonment, cordial devotion, chaste and generous love, magnanimous friendship and childlike innocence, as surely we have no idea of as yet. But we come back to the point: that my “self” and others’ selves are sacred because of humanity. It is humanity *alone* that makes the sacrifice of these good men valuable. We know what Comte and his disciples and George Eliot say to us about humanity. They consider the human race as the one august and precious thing in the universe, yet tell us in the same breath that humanity is a being which sometime will entirely disappear from the universe *and leave not a trace behind it*.

Is this issue, then, such a very important one? Is there not altogether too much truth in Mallock’s bitter saying that such Humanity “is bestial in its infancy, savage in its youth, impure in its manhood, and as a worthy crown will simper through dotage to a hopeless and unremembered grave.” We have come to the end of morality, and some persons think that morality is complete in itself. ~~But~~ this last consideration, to me, necessarily *makes Morality issue in Religion*.

36. I am confident that the conclusion we have now reached as to morality—and to which I believe Socialism will in time lead everybody—is a very helpful one, and especially is the true conclusion; this becomes so very evident when compared with the sadly impotent conclusions, not only of Spencer, but of Sidgwick, Leslie Stephen, and John Stuart Mill.

Is it not a most helpless result to come to for Sidgwick to have to acknowledge, in the concluding portion of his *Methods of Ethics*: “I am unable to construct any systematic answer,

deserving of serious consideration, to the question: what is the Ultimate Good?" and to state in another place, that his treatise "proceeds on the assumption that there are several ultimate ends of action which all claim to be rational ends." And these two lines at the close of Leslie Stephen's *Science of Ethics* are an equally sad commentary on his speculations: "It is a hopeless search—that for some reason binding every man simply as reasonable."

Still more suggestive than anything else it seems to me, it is that this Established Order gave rise to Utilitarianism and that it was a man of the stamp of John S. Mill who championed it. And what shall we think of such reasoning as this: "Each person desires his own happiness or pleasure, thus the general happiness or pleasure must be desirable to the aggregate?" "Every hog desires his own fill, *ergo* the general fill of the pig-sty must be desirable to all the hogs." Is this not precisely his reasoning? and, what! the reasoning of the first teacher of logic!

If anything is assured, it is that we must *not* aim at pleasure—that must not be slurred over. Take the normally decent and serious man, his notion of perfect happiness is not something straggling, as pleasures in themselves are, but is a unity and a system where particulars subserve a whole. Happiness will not come to you as an incident—and it never is anything but incidental—unless you make yourself a whole, and as you cannot be that in yourself, you must become conscious of yourself as a member of a whole, that is identifying your will, your real self, with the ideal—and as a rule what you give is returned with interest, as the general heightening of individual life.

Socialism will bring to all or nearly all, happiness, and to the few who cannot be happy, the still greater boon, blessedness. Happiness is the state of subjective consciousness which occurs spontaneously when all the powers of the individual are in equilibrium, when thought and sympathies have all an adequate object, when one's imagination is supplied with a horizon, and one's self esteem with a proper social function. Happiness is created like the odour of flowers or the harmony of music, is a delight in life when all faculties are developed to their greatest, and all affections satisfied to their utmost capacity.

In all this the good man properly longs to acquire all good things of this life, chief of which is love; the need of a human soul to our thoughts is so profound, that to thousands its satisfaction suffices for happiness. But maybe you will be called upon by incurable disease, by the best welfare of society, to forego it, and all of them. Ethics must require that we should, if asked, forego all pleasure, and then we should do it with our whole heart and willingly—except one. “There is one choicest treasure, which through all self-surrender will remain forever with us, the one that precisely lures to self-sacrifice, which through all denials of self we may to the utmost indulge self”—and that is self-realisation which confers *blessedness*.

There *is*, I maintain, a reason “binding every man simply as reasonable”; there is *one* “ultimate good,” *not* “several ultimate ends.” This, however, has two sides, an objective and a subjective: the first the organic unity of men, the other self-realisation. This, as function, is the principal part, and happiness or pleasure is an entirely secondary affair: good only to tell *whether function is well or ill performed*. This reversal of function and measure is due to the old blunder, considered in Chapter III., of mistaking appearance for reality. We have considered morality as primarily concerned with individuals, and only secondarily with the race; while the reverse is the reality.

Look at these two pictures. Consider first the thwarted life of a bright, educated, talented man now, even in our blessed country. It is proper to take him as a type, for though very much in the minority, the prosperity of all depends to a great degree on his position. If he is in his right place, and everybody aware of the fact, all is harmony. He commences poor, for the multitude that contain the talents are poor. What sacrifices his parents, who see in their children’s advancement compensation for their own miseries, make to get him through the grammar school, high school, college or university! What dreams the young men dream of the great things they will achieve in the next twenty years! Every year how many thousands of such talented youth issue from our various educational institutions fully equipped to make their mark! Now, is it not a fact, that a practical, well-informed man must con-

template this army with absolute dismay, knowing, as he does, that the supply far exceeds the demand? What terrible disappointment awaits these youths! They had much better have remained menials and clod-hoppers, for their culture will be their curse. What, then! is there not work enough in our country waiting to be done? Yes, indeed, but here we meet with the fact, which, as things are, makes the most complete system of education abortive. Though our wealth has multiplied many-fold since the time of the Edwards and the Henries, yet it is the fact, that able minds have now not nearly the chance of being helped to the high positions which they then had. The great mischief is, that the public authority which hitherto has trained them deserts them, has no use for them; that the administration of affairs is in the hands of private masters with the accompanying social mal-adjustment.

That is just the pitiful fact, that these youths have no choice, but have to go for advancement, for employment, for their mere living to private individuals, and appeal to their private interest, to their *favour*; for we have seen in a former chapter, that it is precisely the mark of the highest genius and greatest talents that they cannot create their own opportunities, nor sound their own trumpets. This, at the start, expels some of the greatest geniuses and talents—indeed, they frequently are too shy to appeal to individuals. But let us suppose that they do, and that they obtain employment. In that case they must obey these private individuals and at all times be strictly loyal to their private interests—that is a pre-requisite, inexorably demanded of them; but that, I have claimed, is *immoral*, and if the employer be, as so often is the case, an inferior person, it is doubly immoral. I am, of course, fully aware that this immorality does not enter clearly into the consciousness of these young men, but nevertheless they chafe under their position, it dampens all their ardour, they remain subordinates, and when forty, these men who at twenty had such grand dreams, must be very happy if their mere living is secured to them, in return for daily drudgery. And the others, less fortunate, those superior minds who rebel against their fate? Ah, they are on the slippery, steep incline that leads to the social

inferno—they either are in the abyss, or perilously suspended above it, scorned by the “prominent” and looked down upon by their comrades. For to be a rebel, to refuse obedience and loyalty to private interests is the greatest possible offence in the eyes of those who hold the reins; hence the “blacklisting” of the brainiest manual workers. Is it any wonder, with talents and ability thus positively crushed down, that we seem a nation given over to the cult of base-ball and prize-fighting? With the prizes of life handed over to coarse, cheeky, vulgar, and superficial men, our Fulkersons and Dreyfooses, and genius neglected, can we wonder that we appear to foreigners “a commonplace and essentially slight people?”¹

Then imagine a typical life under Socialism. *Infant*: It will always be welcome, for each there is “a cover laid at nature’s table;” it will never bring anything but sunshine to the home, and never additional cares to the parents; its mother will be instructed in its care and training, yet it will pass its early years joyously in the public *kindergartens*. *Youth*: he and she will pass that most important period of life, in which character is formed, and during which the most decisive crisis occurs, under the constant eye and care of the teacher till adult age, delighted in having their faculties of body and soul, brain and hand developed, being trained in obedience and guided safely through the storms of puberty, all on the same level. *Adult*: flushed with life and useful exertion, he passes his second crisis, that of choosing from among the innumerable possibilities and opportunities that profession and station which is awaiting for him, and for which his capacity, awakened and developed by his mental and manual training, has predestined him. *Friend*: enjoying, now the chasm between the different social activities is filled up, the subtle charms of sympathy with minds supplementary to his own, wherever they are found, and mutually influencing and emulating with each other. *Lover*: adding to the profoundest friendship the glowing but chaste forces of passion, purified from every sort of material considerations, and forming the indestructible bond of marriage, now left mainly in woman’s keeping. *Citizen*: the round man in

¹Sir James Fitzjames Stephen,

the round hole, ability having the leadership, not as a matter of chance, or of personal favour, but as a matter of *right*, with loyal seconders, participating in the government by his function; sure of his place and his due maintenance as long as he performs his duty. *Aged*: a burden no longer to anybody, but enjoying his well-earned pension; living over his life again in his sympathy with the young, realising what has always been the ideal: that of being each in his circle the sage, the truly wise, the judge, the adviser, and looking confidently forward to another existence, not, however, a mere prolongation or second volume of this.

- The other day we had a curious commentary on the Established Order in the retiring moderator of the Presbyterian assembly praising God that his co-religionists controlled so much of "the Lord's money"—to wit, many hundreds of millions of dollars. The knell of such miserable "order" is sounding, the change will come, society will ere long relieve *every one* of her members from responsibility to material interests which have hitherto degraded human life to the ground, by providing for his physical subsistence and leaving him free to accomplish the true end of his being. It will come.

A thorough Utopian view this
of the typical life of modern Socialism.
—taking no note of Human Nature
as we always find it nor of a variety
of the circumstances it must undergo
the realisation of such a system impossible
even if it were really just

CHAPTER VI.

GOD IN HUMANITY.

"Philosophic Morality may start without God ; it cannot finish without Him."—*Elme M. Caro.*

"There is a statement of Religion possible which makes all scepticism absurd."—*Emerson.*

37. Morality remains imperfect, till humanity becomes precious. Saintly men and women, let me repeat, however lovely in themselves, do not make humanity precious ; it is humanity that gives value to their lives and labours, even to the life and death of a Father Damien.

How helpless humanity is by itself ! We shudder at the desolate condition of a handful of people in an open boat in mid-ocean ; we hardly realise that our actual condition on this globe of ours, whirling through space, suspended between two infinities, is just as lonesome ; that we are by ourselves just as insignificant as a crowd of ants in a huge ant-hill. We may have ever so many saints among us—how can they help themselves or us ? Then think of the time, sure to come, when humanity in the flesh will disappear leaving not a trace behind it ! If all ends in smoke, what is the value of Morality, Love, Sympathy, Sacrifice ? We are entitled to ask that question, for Utilitarianism is right in this, that utility is an inherent element of Morality, as it is of Value.

This leads us to the problem : will the coming socialist society be religious or atheistic ? To be frank, the main purpose of this essay has been, from the first, to solve this problem, as far as possible. I honestly believe I have something worth saying on this point, simply because I have for years lived in imagination under a socialist *régime*.

Emerson says: "There is a statement of religion possible which makes all scepticism absurd." I am confident that American Socialism can make such a statement, this will be its intellectual achievement. Again, I contend that Socialism can show morality necessarily evolving a belief in God and Immortality as a tree bears blossoms and fruit, that I call its moral achievement. Thus the preceding chapters become preparatory steps to what follows. And, in order to be perfectly frank, I will here admit that my hope of this essay's attracting some attention lies just in the fact that I have, as I believe, some novel ideas on these tremendous subjects of God and Immortality. I am fully aware that in spite of our prevailing scepticism my fellowmen have an insatiable curiosity in regard to any publication that so much as pretends to have anything to say on these matters. Witness the fact, that a most foolish book, entitled, *The To-morrow of Death*, translated from the French, enjoyed half-a-dozen editions in a few months after its appearance in London. I maintain, then, that Socialism will give us such a view of God as will satisfy the most developed intellect. I say that it is possible to predict what men will think on these subjects a century hence in a society where a socialist régime will have prevailed, say, fifty years. I further deem myself able to prove in the following pages that they will be all but unanimous in affirmation of the questions about which such a scepticism now reigns.

Before I go to the heart of the matter, let me advance a few general considerations. Many Socialists now assume that when this world ceases to be a "vale of tears," particularly when it becomes a very paradise, men will not care a particle for another world. I believe there never was a greater error.

I believe, first, that the leisure, the ease, that will prevail will precisely dispose men to transcendental thoughts; that when they get out of this world all that heart can wish, they will want to storm heaven by force. It will be with the earth as with the magnificent estate of which Dr. Johnston said: "Ay, sir, these are the things that make Death bitter!"¹—and he knew human

¹ Cardinal Mazarin expressed the same thought lying on his deathbed,

nature pretty well. To quote the Frenchmen of the First Revolution who pretty generally embraced atheism is not to the point, for the state of a people, all the time labouring under a tremendous excitement, and, so to say, breathing an atmosphere of fire that made their very brains boil in their heads, will surely not apply to a socialist community.

But of all general considerations the most important probably is, that the period in which we are living, which began with the Reformation, and now with railroad-speed is drawing to a close, is a *transition period*, and as such is, like the parallel time of the decline of Rome, naturally first sceptical, then irreligious. On the other hand, *Organic Ages*, like Antiquity, the Middle Ages—to which will soon be added the coming Socialist Age—are just as naturally, from the unity and corporate responsibility that obtain there, intensely religious.

The Middle Age shows this connection most lucidly. Its feudal society, thoroughly harmonised by a logical and effective system of ideas, constituted a splendid unity and organism whose parts were vividly conscious of their functions, while all efforts and ambitions converged in one direction. As a consequence, the “heavens were imagined in close and tangible contact with the daily life of man ; all were compelled to obtain the great prize of life by the same formula.” Then we had a compact, coherent society, the functions of widely differentiated parts concurring to a common end, and with certain fundamental destinies in common ; each in his due proportion participated in the divine blessing upon earth, while each looked forward to an identical glory.

It is a similar system that will obtain in the future, but raised on a far higher plane, with delusions gone, and a true brotherhood established.

38. We know that now numbers of intelligent and well-informed men downright deny the existence of God, and what, indeed, is far worse, that scepticism on that point is more rampant and widespread among the masses than it ever was in Rome eighteen cen-

when surrounded by innumerable objects of art and luxury he exclaimed, “Oh, how hard it is to leave these things !”

turies ago. What I have not a particle of doubt of in my own mind is, that Socialism will radically reverse this state of things: it will in the minds of the vast majority *make all doubt on that point impertinent*.

By the advent and the following radical transformation of Socialism, mankind will, in very truth, be granted nothing less than a real revelation from God which none can dispute—a revelation *through human history*. What now most naturally creates scepticism will then just as irresistibly create belief. To deny God's existence will seem to mankind very much the same thing as denying their own existence as men. That is to say, the history of man will appear like a whole divine drama unrolling before the very eyes of humanity. That which makes this remarkable difference between then and now is simply the different points of view. It so happens that now—as in every transition period—we are in the midst, in the thick of the plot, the most vital of the plots so far, and the vast majority of men do not see any issue out of it. Worse than that, our Spencers and other popular moral teachers affirm that it will remain an unsolved plot forever, that the present social state is final, and that all further progress must consist in accommodating ourselves as best we may to this state. Where such shortsightedness obtains, history can be nothing else than a record of force and fraud. But with Socialism we have a solution of the plot, and all previous epochs and events are seen to be preparations for it—history assumes the character of a drama.

And a *divine* drama. Mankind used to ask for miracles in proof of the truth of the Gospels. What they really wanted was evidence of the intelligence behind phenomena, and they looked for such evidence in *infractions* of the natural order. Socialism will at once open men's eyes to the fact that the history of man has been a standing, continuous miracle; but it is the *order* in that history which will prove to them the existence of God as convincingly as any fact ever was proved from circumstantial evidence.

The first link of that chain of evidence is already supplied by modern science—to wit, the law of evolution. It was a most

fortunate circumstance that men found that no scientific observation of phenomena was possible unless directed and interpreted at least hypothetically by some theory, and that the more complex the phenomena the greater the necessity, and that they thus discovered the law of evolution. But they fail as yet to see its vast significance. The same men who use it to interpret the phenomena of the past are, so to speak, caught in the thicket of the plot in the midst of which we find ourselves, and refuse to use it to find the path out of it; and so they preach the arrant nonsense that evolution dethrones God. With the advent of a socialistic régime all will see, as a matter of course, that evolution, instead of overturning a belief in God, overturns really a barbarous and crude conception of the way God works. Evolution, then, will precisely make *the presence of God the only possible working hypothesis*.

What religious people hitherto had exclusively to trust to and build on was the universal human instinct; that chance did not stumble on every living thing, particularly that unique thing, human consciousness and its wonderful contents, science, art, morality, and the "thoughts that wander through eternity." They postulated purpose, in order to avoid the notion, shocking to that instinct, of a "fortuitous concourse of atoms." But Socialism, as said, vouchsafes us a complete, true *revelation* of the Supreme Will: *it suddenly reveals to us a brilliantly illuminated segment of itself*.

Imagine yourself living at the advent of that Golden Age and look back the long stretch as far as tradition and scientific vision will take you: societies of men evolved from social beasts of the field, themselves for a long time not much less cruel and beastly than their progenitors, and blindly and laboriously groping in the dark. But it is evident to you, from the bird's-eye view you now have, that a superior power is preparing a path for them, leading their tottering steps, overruling their vagaries, and preventing them from straying seriously away and going to destruction. Their freedom is fortunately limited: they are as much in leading strings as children ever were. At the very start the infancy of their children is somehow lengthened, and this, you see, creates home and its affections. Love suddenly appears on the theatre of

human consciousness ; man finds it pleasant, and is thus encouraged to develop it more.

You can see how man was led from stage to stage, step by step. Nation after nation arose, ascended a stage, then declined, but not till it had handed the torch of human progress to another nation just ascending. Men fought battles at Marathon, Hastings, Magdeburg, and Lützen, at Gettysburg and Sedan, and all these battles had a meaning, and were fought to accomplish the solidarity, the fellowship of humanity. Men enslaved their fellow-men, but slavery will be seen to have been the necessary initial stage of civilisation, and preparatory to a higher, to serfdom ; this, again, to wage-dom, and this to social co-operation. Men tortured, burned, and scourged each other—survivals from their animal past—but none of these torturings, burnings, and crucifixions were suffered in vain. One selfish genius after another arose—an Alexander, a Cæsar, a Napoleon—who thought to make humanity a stepping-stone to their own exaltation ; they were suffered to play their private game, believing that they were following simply their private impulses, but as soon as they ceased to contribute to a larger life for mankind, they were struck down. At length the lowest, most numerous class of society awoke to self-consciousness, and this inaugurated the last act of the drama. With Socialism, *purpose* can, like a red thread, be traced all through history ; God's *presence* will be a demonstrated *fact* : REASON TRIUMPHS.

This will be a glorious achievement of Socialism in the religious sphere. It seems to me self-evident that every rational man, capable of fully imagining himself in a socialist *régime*, and persuaded of its near advent, must thereby become vividly conscious and convinced of God's presence.

When Socialism will have made belief in God vivid and strong in the masses, we shall witness our dogmatic churches, desirous of preserving continuous life, re-shape their dogmas in accordance with the new revelation, and that perhaps will infuse new life into them ; but religious "professors" will no longer teach that Adam's fall is responsible for whatever evils may still afflict us.

39. We now come to another intellectual achievement of Social-

ism in the religious sphere—much more important than may appear on first view : it is the new view it will give us of morality. We have hitherto persistently considered it as a fact, a force ; now it becomes a *law*. Not a “law” like that of gravitation, which, we remember, is rather a force, but a rule of action which we can disobey, but to the penalty of which we then must submit.

To-day we talk sufficiently about morality as “the moral law,” but the very greatest mischief is, precisely, that our intellect does not recognise its quality as law. Hear Sidgwick : “I do not find in my moral consciousness any intuition, claiming to be clear and certain, that the performance of duty will be adequately rewarded and its violation punished.” We constantly see this so-called moral law violated with impunity; we are altogether blind to the penalty. The most astonishing thing is that Mill, ay ! that John Stuart Mill is blind to it. On page 41 of his *Utilitarianism* we read : “The ultimate sanction of all morality is a subjective feeling in our minds. This sanction has no binding efficacy on those who do not possess the feelings it appeals to.” This, surely, is a serious matter ; I should say that a theory like the above, which maintains in effect, that a man may get rid of his sense of moral obligation if he can, and that if he does the obligation is gone, is as grossly immoral a theory as ever was published. And Mill evidently accepted this theory, though he prefers not to say so ; he only adds, “But this is a danger not confined to Utilitarian morality.” Morison, also, in his *Service of Man*, evidently does not believe in the moral law (which as such must apply to all), for he divides mankind into two classes : “Those who manifestly have a congenital bias to vicious and malignant crime, who have no good instincts on which a moral teacher can work,” and “those with a prompt unreflecting bias toward good.” The first class he proposes ruthlessly to weed out for ever, and to retain only the last one in his new society.

These various sentiments are evidently diametrically opposed to the philosophy of morality set forth in these pages, and what is more, they constitute too sandy a foundation for any sort of real morality. They *cannot* be the truth. The first reason why men how really do not believe in any moral law is, of course, that they

do not really believe in God's presence. When we become convinced, as a socialist *régime* will convince us, that there is a PURPOSE in the world, then morality becomes a law. Morality is evidently deep in this purpose, since it is the indispensable condition for social welfare. It is only when there is a purpose that science discovers the reign of law, whether in physical, physiological, or social phenomena; or wherever she discovers powerful tendencies that yet will become law, then the delayed purpose of the Universal Being is still manifested while awaiting fulfilment.

Under Socialism the supreme intelligence will be seen sitting in the chair of that authority with which Chapter II. opened, but which was acknowledged there as only a blind force, though the adjective "benevolent" was applied—a little too previously, I grant—to it. He will be acknowledged as the Ultimate Reason, and as such our only final guarantee that the universe will not restore itself into chaos before our eyes, so to speak. "He has so arranged the world as to let us know that morality is the law he has prescribed for you and me. The law is inflexible but noble, and should excite the sincere wish to make it our urgent business to act up to it and carry it out." That makes him the *law-giver*, and the Universal Order that we first of all met with. This is the rational and manly way to look at it, and the worthiest conception of it.

Secondly, morality is a law, because we have to some extent Free-will, i.e., power of refusing to obey it. We feel that free-will is a pre-requisite to morality; that without it there would be no morality. But how shall we reconcile these two things, that morality is both a law and a fact? We have already answered this question by saying that the proper use of free-will consists in voluntarily and consciously conforming to the Supreme Will, to the Order of the Cosmos. Those who are not satisfied with such a free-will, who want it to be a rambling, vagrant liberty, should bear in mind that God Himself is evidently equally limited. Modern atheism has undeniably this justification, that He whom popular religions worship is clearly a false "god"; a lordly, capricious, omnipotent, and, in particular, a *lawless* despot. Our reason compels us to assume, on the other hand, that once having

established the Order of the World, God is as much bound by it as we are. And here the penalty comes in. This order of the world is not jeopardised by our disobedience: it is bound to be enforced. No, it is we who lose by it; it is *we who fail* by disobeying; we become failures, become—to use a very expressive word—“demoralised.” This is the most suggestive difference between the civil and the moral law, that the former is concerned for its enforcement, the latter for the motive, with which it is obeyed—since it is sure of being enforced in the end.

But the respect where this becomes of by far the most practical concern to us is, that it is by the establishment of this moral *law*, and only thus, that we become God's *co-workers*. The happiest way, it seems to me, of defining an ideal human law, is by saying that *it is a rule of action, for the common good, made by the clear and far-seeing for the short-sighted*. Both classes of men, so far as they are rational, want to do the right thing, but all do not know what is right. Apply this to the moral law. God has prescribed it for us: we co-operate, *by acting God's thought*. We have seen that virtually our whole evolution so far has been, and indeed up to the realisation of Socialism, will be, natural evolution, *i.e.*, a development in which God's purpose is virtually the sole directing force. We have been, and are still, part and parcel of an onward growth, against which it would be useless to rebel—aye, to which it is our great privilege to conform. But in this evolution men are far from being superfluous or mere tools. We cannot, as Spencer seems to want to have it, fold our hands and await events. God cannot do without us: He needs our co-operation, and those who obey the summons are amply rewarded for their labours and sacrifices; they are paid by the day, by the hour, we may almost say by the piece.

And here I come to a point, which I pray my readers to note well, and which, it seems to me, will alone justify this section, and also justify my calling our conception of the moral “law” an *intellectual* achievement. The unknown author of *God in His World* says: “They that believe wait upon Him; they behold His works and *though they know not the way thereof*, though it hath for them wonderful surprises, they co-operate therewith. * * *

The world is awaiting a new Pentecost. But what embodiment in human economics this new spiritual revival will take we know not. They are the friends of God, building with Him *they know not clearly what*—they have never known.” This, in other words, is the same view which Robert Browning holds when he writes: “The individual knows nothing of the Divine scheme.”

This, I contend, is a fatal blunder—a *most mischievous, practical mistake*. How is it possible to be co-workers with one whose plans we know not? The whole drift of this essay is precisely that we can, and are bound to know, God’s schemes for our immediate future, and this, again, in the highest sense, is what makes his thoughts and morality a *law* for us. It should always be borne in mind, that we possess *individuality*, and that mankind has been divided up into *individualities*, precisely, because it has a work to do in this earth-life, because we are intended to be co-operators with God.

40. But also remember that it is our Equality—what is common in us all—that “entitles us to the Divine regard.” The typical life with which Chapter V. closed was, at bottom, a society, where each individuality had got into its proper *niche*; but when the socialist commonwealth is fully evolved, it is Equality that will establish *the Kingdom of Heaven on earth*. At present there are without doubt noble men whose very nobility of heart makes them atheists; their atheism is the cry of an outraged conscience: they have abandoned God because of the evils which he permits and the prevailing pharisaism of the churches. Ah! it is *man himself* who is responsible for by far the greater part of the evils under which he suffers, and it is man that will establish the Kingdom of Heaven.

In all ages, whenever religion was really powerful and ennobling, it was not at all limited to caring for the private soul, but it was identified with efforts to realise heaven on earth; identified with some great sweep of social action in which individual lives were, so to say, caught up to meet ideal passions from above. Again, the “kingdom of heaven” which Jesus meant, was, without a particle of doubt, first and last a society *on earth*, with other

social conditions, where the prevailing cruel social injustice should be redressed. As centuries roll on, the name of Jesus will be more and more venerated precisely on account of his social teachings, and his Dives and Lazarus acknowledged as fitting types of man's long degradation. It is here that Socialism will complement Christianity. As Jesus has divided the old world from the new by *proclaiming* the Kingdom of Heaven, the brotherhood of man, so Socialism is destined to *realise* it.

Our current pharisaism necessarily turns the hearts of the masses and all noble men away from God. It deals with private interests exclusively, and turns the Universal God into a mere respecter of persons, subject to all the caprices of a petty earthly despot. Henry James, sen., truly says, "Our churches teach that the true aim of religion is to attest a difference between men, that certain persons are purer and better in God's estimation than others, and thereby inflame all that is basest and most selfish in our nature by nursing an insane dread of personal damnation."

Frankly, does not the case, as a matter of fact, stand thus : that our self-righteous "moral" man has an assured conviction of God's particular esteem for him, John Smith ; that God knows his features, recognises him when he prays and in effect says to himself, "This John Smith is a person whose interests I will certainly look after, while that miserable Tom Jones shall certainly go to hell !" And—these again are the words of Henry James, sen. : "While John Smith and his comfortable and influential friends are trying to cajole God, they are filling their felonious pockets with dollars coined out of the sweat and blood of their helpless, starved brethren. They are the enemies of the Kingdom of God because they in their overpowering lust of mammon are content to live in such glaring iniquitous relations with their fellow-men as virtually condemn the vast majority to degrading want and ignorance, and lift a small class into idle abundance." For this is precisely the fact, that the cause of our social evils lies in the prevalent inhumanity of one to another as organised in our boasted political and social institutions. How can we have the Kingdom of Heaven as long as every man must assume that every other

man he meets on the street, in hall or church, is selfishly intent on selfish interests?

But if the Pharisees, however pious they may be, oppose the coming of the Kingdom of God, what shall we say of those sedulous cultivators of intellect, who spend their forces in self-culture, and look with contempt, or, at most, with pity on the struggling world? In one of his books, Renan, that excellent representative of this class, actually writes: "If we could reform the world, we ought to take good care not to do it, because—(observe!) this world is really *too curious* a thing to contemplate for the thinker!" If, then, this class only would "contemplate" the world exactly! but they have hardly an idea how their fellow-men live. Witness O. B. Frothingham who, a few months back, could write: "I do not see that there is much inevitable indigence in the world!" It is the same Renan, furthermore, who fathers this odious sentiment: "Society is a vast organism, where entire classes *should live by the glory* and enjoyment of others, like the peasant of the Ancient *Régime* who worked for the noble and *loved him for it*, who *enjoyed* (*sic!*) the high life which his sweat enabled the others to lead (!)." It is those people who by their scientific almsgiving ("organised charity") rob charity of what poor resemblance it has to Love.

What a difference I find in this respect between Victor Hugo and our own Emerson! What a splendid lesson Hugo has given us just in this respect to ponder over—and for which alone I do not grudge him all the adulation of which he was the object—in that Christ-like figure of the good Bishop who turns a *Jean Valjean* into a *Maire Madeleine*! Compare on the other hand Emerson in his *Conduct of Life*, where we read: "Those for whom it is an *honour* to labour," and "those who only suggest the reflection of their *small value*." "The worst effect of charity is that the lives you are asked to preserve *are not worth preserving!!!* Masses! the calamity is the masses; I do not wish any masses at all, but honest men only; lovely, sweet, accomplished women only. Nature makes eighty poor melons for one that is good." "The guano races of mankind, carted over to *manure* the fertile fields of America—and *rot* (!)." "

What an idea to compare men with melons! Is it not true, as once said, that those timid fugitives from the duties and work of the world, who have retired to nurse their cold intellects, are desperately selfish and have wilfully turned their backs upon the goal which Providence has set for man? It is such sympathetic souls as Hugo, who do not sneer at the "masses," but try to bring them up to their own level and make them all vigorous and sane and good and wise and holy in the measure of their well-balanced capacities, that are the true co-workers with God. They know that among the "masses" there are as great geniuses—aye, and much greater than our Emerson himself—and it is *only opportunity* that they need.

Yes, in spite of Hugo's many follies and idiosyncracies I am ready to kneel down to him for his *Les Misérables*. It is such noble minds as his who will at last turn men's hearts, and make them resolve that society shall no longer break God's social and economic laws—for, never forget this: unselfishness is now practically impossible for the individual, since society is, at present, an organised warfare against the Kingdom of God. How small a residuum of evils then we should have to trace to unavoidable accidents! And perhaps but little of that residuum could fitly be called "evil." Many ills are due to ancestral errors, but the recuperative powers of nature are astonishing; we need only go steadily on in order to cancel ere long the consequences of being apathetic for generations.

Self-restraining morality or Duty will entirely cease to exist as such in our future perfect society, for when the interests of my fellow-men become identical with my own—as they will under Socialism—I shall plainly be a stupid person if I do not do my duty in every respect. Yet this branch of morality—which thus is merely incidental to human destiny—is what fills our "moral" citizen with peacock-like pride; simply not to rob their fellow-men of a farthing entitles them, in their opinion, to squeeze the last farthing due them, say for rent, out of a poor widow. It is self-expanding morality, love and sympathy, that will make man "in action like an angel, in comprehension like God." It will be a love developing the most passionate social relation, whether with relatives,

friends, neighbours, and fellow-countrymen, till at last our existence is widened to the dimensions of universal humanity. It will be a love that will see in the most depraved a brother and sister with, at least, a spark of the divine in his or her nature.

I know well enough, that many good people will loudly protest against this idea, that Justice will in time be effaced by Love. To strengthen my position then, I wish to quote the following from *God in His World*: "Justice is not a divine attribute. Even in human affairs justice has no significance, save in connection with the conventional adjustments of a perverted life. Injustice must be manifest before there could be a conception of justice, which is an outward, mechanical righteousness, equity of division. *The very notion of justice arises only from injustice.*"

41. Nothing has—nothing could have so much and so well commended Christianity to mankind as the touching conception by Jesus of God as *Our Father*. There can be no doubt that life under a socialist régime will vividly justify to our minds that name to the Intelligence behind evolution which then will clearly be perceived to have acted the *role* of a tender father to us, leading us like little children by the hand, while we all the time were perfectly unconscious both of the road we were going and the goal we were to reach. But how is it possible now for the majority of men, living as they do in order to work, and themselves blind as they are, led by blind leaders, to see in God a Father? Must it not rather seem to them to add mockery to injury, in naked truth to place a crown of thorns upon their brows, when our religious teachers try to justify the present arrangements by the will of this "Almighty Father?" A few years ago a book, *The Ground-work of Economics*, by C. S. Devas, was published, that almost reaches the lowest depth of such insulting sophistry. This is the summing up:

"I have given the Christian justification of inequality among men in regard to wealth, enjoyment, and remuneration of labour, nor do I believe that any other justification can be found, any other conclusive answer to the socialist objections against accumulations of wealth in a few hands. Mercantile profits and rents and

interest can be justified, indeed, on the grounds of the union of the rich and poor and the *mutual position assigned them by Providence*. He from whom the right comes may attach conditions to its enjoyment. Let the labourer then cease from murmuring. He can claim from his fellow-men to have as much of the produce of his labour as will give him opportunity for a decent existence; he has no right to more, nor yet any right to refuse to produce more than this quantity. The surplus may be spent in ways he dislikes; he may receive from those whom this contribution of his enables to live a cultivated life only scorn and neglect. *But all this is not his concern*. It is not for him to discuss the mysterious dispositions and permissions of Divine Providence; if those who hold power misuse his contributions to the life of that society, it is not for him to punish. There is One who sees and in His own time will bring all to account."

Is it not evident that Socialism will quite otherwise conceive God's Fatherhood, by showing that "in His own time" He *has* brought all to account? For clearly, if the present arrangements are His will, then the coming changes, and *the advent of Socialism, particularly, will, in a special sense, be His "will."*

Then no man will be so blasphemous as to write as Devas further does: "There can be no doubt of the *superiority of the rich to the rude and toiling multitude*. In Christian societies these inequalities of property are a cause of *union, binding together the various members of the commonwealth*, and are occasions for abundant compensations, of charity, generous contributions to religion, public buildings, patronage over work-people and serving the State without pay."

God has proved Himself and will still more prove Himself a "father" in a way that precisely befits man's destiny: by giving him will to overcome his circumstances, and by intensifying his will, his manliness; and history has shaped itself from the beginning according to this programme. "God has incessantly been eliciting man's inherent pith and substance by provoking him to throw off all outward dependance." Henry James, sen., says: "Hence men have come to dislike mere toil as servile. Mechanics, without a doubt, embody as large a measure of human worth and furnish as

good an illustration of solid manliness, true human sweetness, as those of any class, but the temporary social inferiority of the mechanics is perhaps a good thing, as furnishing the necessity of stimulating them to feel disgust at the actual servitude to which they are subject. A perfect society will never allow any of her members to remain content with mercenary labour; and therefore they are goaded with incessant slights and sarcasms until they compel society to lift them above the accursed necessity of earning their bread by the sweat of their brows."

A Chinese philosopher of the thirteenth century said: "The essence is always without desire, wherefore He may be called Little. All beings owe subjection to Him, and He does not consider Himself as their Lord, wherefore He may be called Great."

• This doctrine of the self-abnegation of God is a noble thought—this, that God's whole existence of Beatitude is a "Giving-forth," a bestowal of good, absolute Love, in which Selfishness has no place whatever; and this is a conception which, I am sure, Socialism will very much strengthen.

42. When Darwinism pretends to be not merely a probable scientific hypothesis, but a full philosophical interpretation of the universe, and of the whole course of organic evolution, as well as mental, moral, and social evolution in man, we have a right to dispute these all-embracing pretensions. That mankind from its natural side has descended from a social animal, that is both credible and a great philosophic achievement; but surely we have still another kinship, a divine descent, which, as I apprehend, Socialism will make good.

Let us try to explain Jesus. Explain him? Yes, I should say, that if any phenomenon in the world needs explanation, it is Jesus and his wonderful supremacy over the centuries—more and more wonderful the more rationalistic men become. What a marvel, that he who, dying on the cross, seemed the deadest of failures, rose to the most splendid empire, so splendid that it may be deemed worth many crucifixions; that he, a man, became the incarnate God; that he, a Jewish carpenter, became the adored of kings of power and intellect! It can, of course, be explained, for it surely

was not a matter of chance, but of internal necessity. There must be a reason why mankind unanimously, intensely, and persistently believed that God took on human form and suffered in human ways—aye, there must so much the more be a reason, the more singular it now appears. I think the reason for this is also the reason for that other phenomenon, to be noticed in the following section, why he became the mediator between God and man. It is, that mankind had a vague idea of, an instinct for, *the truth*—the wit: that there is the closest affinity between God and man, that God, whatever else He is, is essentially human, and that the personality of God is identical with the personality of human. Frances Power Cobbe notices the strange fact, that the name of Jesus has entirely put God into the background, and usurped His authority. That came about most naturally. Man felt that the essence of humanity constitutes his own real self, his own personality, so there the personality of God must be present, not being able to grasp that idea, he took Jesus for the symbol of all Humanity. In other words, God is the Supreme Reality that evokes, draws out, the social self within us; He is the *Soul of Humanity*—the “Collective Conscience” of Chapter II.—giving unity, as our “self” gives unity to the ever-changing, never-ending particles of the visible body. We are each of us an integral part of the body of the living God. Pantheism is God in nature; the deeper truth, I suggest, is God in Humanity.

No man in our generation has had a truer insight into the relations that ought to exist among men, or a nobler intuition of God in His true relation to man than Henry James, *sen.* He has painted these relations in the most glowing colours, contrasted the actual and ideal relations almost to perfection, first in one work, and then dissatisfied with his effort, has tried the same again in another yet another work,¹ and after all accomplished very little of the good that he intended, and has secured but a very small number of readers, simply because he only preached, because he only tried to work on men’s hearts—his works, in other words, were castles in the air, without any support. Yet he saw, saw well enough, that it was our economic system which contained the cr

¹ *Substance and Shadow.*

so to speak, that is to turn the whole social machinery; but how it could be done, still less how it *would* be done, he did not tell. Yet it is just here the emphasis is to be laid. James gives an excellent illustration of what progress or evolution truly means: the persistent effort of the paternal divine element to elevate man out of the mud and mire of his origin and assert its own essential primacy. He happily compares the process to the forming of a statue. Nature gives us body as the marble gives the statue visible incorporation; but the sculptor forms it by endowing the marble with his own genius, thus animating it, *giving it soul*. This is done by a gradual process of skilful but firm elimination and rejection; and Man's history is likewise a ceaseless *elimination* or rejection of every trait of his animal origin, approaching more and more the ideal image of the Infinite. With Darwinists, to contemplate only our natural descent is to make men like unto a statue which is conspicuous chiefly for its material, where the substance out of which it is fashioned challenges more attention than the plastic power of the sculptor over the substance. "Is it not a perfect statue just when the form imposed by the sculptor completely ravishes, swallows up and subjugates the material of the marble?"

He constantly insists that the essence, almost the whole nature of God is Love. That He is of a love so infinite, so void of self-love, that "even in bestowing His own eternal blessedness upon us, He immerses Himself in His creatures' own atmosphere, diminishes Himself with unflattering constancy to His creatures' own level, condescends with loving perseverance to every weakness." If God is indeed the power behind evolution—if there be *any* power behind—then surely He has with lovingkindness lowered Himself to the most hideous abysses of our human nature, since we have seen the most divine love and sympathy developed from the coarsest and most brutish germs. This should be remembered by those who think I have wrongfully made of love of approbation such a mighty motive in a previous chapter. I fully believe Socialism will force this upon our comprehension, and that this again will call forth love in us if anything will, and "make us see so keenly all the horror and hideousness of our overpowering cupidity and ferocity of manners as to avert ourselves from it and eventually disown

every method and institution of our associated life which nourishes and perpetuates it."

What a difference between Comte's and George Eliot's "Humanity," and the same humanity heartily believed to be animated throughout by God's spirit. It is the difference between a corpse and a living being. And what a difference between the God of theologians—one they got hold of *per saltum*, by a leap outside the concrete world—and the God that Socialism will reveal: a working Divinity "grimy with the dust and sweat of our most carnal appetites and passions, and bent on the patient, toilsome, thorough cleansing of our self from its odious, natural defilement!"

43. Here we have arrived at the culmination of this essay. All that precedes has been so many steps leading up to the answer of the question: Why is Humanity so supremely precious? Jesus has been looked upon, not only as the incarnate God, but as the mediator between the individual and God. Socialism, as said, will also give us the explanation of this. Mankind felt the need of a mediator, and with a vague sense of the truth they made Jesus, the man of sorrows, a symbol of humanity. The truth was and is, that Humanity is our mediator. Humanity is the medium through which we enter into communion with God—this is the keystone of any coherent system of morality and the crown of all preceding speculations. "Men hitherto foolishly supposed, and the more moral they were the more they supposed, that God's redemptive operation was confined to the isolated individual bosom. Whenever they fancied themselves in any degree superior to their fellow-men around them, there was no end of cackling and self-complacency, or if inferior, no end of chagrin; they appropriated the great life of God to their own puny selves and converted it to every perverse, infernal form of self-seeking," as Henry James, sen., says. All they cared for was their own personal salvation at His hand; and they supposed they did what was pleasant in His sight, when they worried Him with their private griefs and appeals. Socialism will surely reverse this and teach us, that God has no vital relation to us individually except through humanity, and that only by working for humanity can we know Him. God will be in-

Comte
Crozier
Curtis
+ Proprietor

timately known—not in nature, not even in the individual bosom, but—in *man*, first through history; later, still better through institutions, and our organic unity. We shall learn, what is the simple truth, that He takes no interest whatever in our passing evils, however hideous, as they affect us individually, any more than He does in our tooth-aches. Then we shall find out that His creative presence is in humanity, that He looks upon no portion of His creatures as hopelessly lost, but that the grand aim of His majestic providence on earth is to mould us gradually out of our most degraded conditions into the dignity of social beings. We shall enter into communion with Him when the evils, incident to our rudimentary methods of intercourse, become so palpable by their contradictions with our better self as to make us heartily ashamed of ourselves, and sick of our political and social guides. Then we shall come to see, that no man does evil untempted without having all other men to help him by standing aloof from him and leaving him in abject penury, physical and moral; then the noble, energetic minds among us, quickened by the ever-growing tyranny of the atrocious forms of misery, vice, and crime, will perceive that only by bearing their brethren along with them and lifting them up, can they reach God.

As Henry James eloquently says: "What does the paltry evil-doing of even our criminals amount to against our organised inclemency of man to man? When myriads of His creatures are starving, for the base food of the body, while the gambling-house and brothel are recognised necessities of our social fabric, and the interests of one class are organised in ruthless hostility to those of all other classes."

Comte's Humanity is a Great Being, unworthy of our homage, since it is without any aspirations that are not selfish. Humanity under Socialism, with the highest possible function, that of uniting us with God, is worth living and dying for. In conclusion, I point once more to that gambler and swindler who willingly sacrificed his life in rescuing poor servant girls, and in that moment truly realised his nobler self: united his real self with God.

CHAPTER VII.

THE HEREAFTER.

"All the efforts of ten thousand Ethical Societies will count as nothing in the furtherance of ethical regeneration, compared with the work of the man who shall again convince the world that every human soul is immortal; and that such a task is not beyond the reach of man I am thoroughly convinced."—*Th. Davidson, The Ethical Record*, Jan., '90.

44. Prof. Huxley somewhere says: "If the proof of immortality is forthcoming, it is my conviction that no drowning sailor ever clutched a hencoop more tenaciously than mankind will hold by such a proof—whatever it may be." I think this expresses human nature eminently well, and that they who pretend to be satisfied with this earthly life alone are, to say the least, not good representatives of mankind at large. I think it may be truthfully said, that the interest of nearly all sober and serious men in any new thought is proportional to its possible relation to human final *destiny*; that, human nature being what it is, immortality is practically *the important thing* to men, without which—frankly speaking—even God's existence would be of much less concern to most men.

Since it is precisely sober and serious men to whom I appeal, it will be a final and decisive argument in favour of Socialism to show that it has the closest and most direct relation to human destiny. Its first great religious achievement: that it inevitably brings to all healthy minds a conviction of God's presence and moral government has in itself a strong bearing on human destiny, and if this essay ended there, with proving, in other words, the preciousness of Humanity, it ought to commend a socialist *régime* to thoughtful minds. But in this final chapter we are to proceed a good deal further, and show almost conclusively, as it seems to me, that Socialism will very much influence

our belief in Immortality. This is the second great religious achievement of American Socialism: that it will, not so much give us new proof of immortality, as strongly incline our minds to heartily accept the kind of personal, immortal life which will satisfy the most developed intellect—that is to say: *Immortality, bereft of illusions.*

Man will in the future, as in the past, consider the question on broad grounds of moral probability. That he by nature is inclined to believe himself immortal, there is no doubt. "Not alone that there is something overwhelming in the thought that all our rich stores of spiritual acquisition may at any moment perish with us, but it contradicts our reason."¹ The *reasonableness* of the universe can maintain its ground only by insisting on immortality; to deny the everlasting persistence of the moral element in man is to rob the whole process of evolution of its meaning. This reasoning will be marvellously strengthened by the socialist conception of God, Humanity, and their relations as outlined in the previous chapter.

Meanwhile, science is already now, contrary to the common notion, doing much to answer the question in the same way. By proving the conservation of energy she really has made another conscious existence—more than one, in fact—possible, aye! likely; she has certainly *proved* that we shall never escape out of the circle of existence and into annihilation.

It is indeed the best answer to sceptics, and something that their attention, curiously enough, is seldom directed to: that all difficulties that may be raised to a future life are applicable to the present existence. It is not another life that is unreasonable: *it is this life that is inexplicable.* It is not unreasonable to believe that what daily happens, what happens every morning on awakening from deep sleep—the awakening into conscious life—may happen after death, and then be simply as inexplicable as now. But it is unreasonable to say that "Nature, after her long, deep, unconscious sleep, should have a bright dream, called consciousness, to be succeeded by a heavy, eternal slumber of death again;" or as John Fiske puts it, "that the life of the soul ends with the

¹ *Creed of Science.*

life of the body, is, perhaps, the most colossal instance of baseless assumption known in the history of philosophy."

I, then, maintain that Socialism will wonderfully strengthen the conviction that this life is but *one* act in a divine drama, simply because the supreme value of Humanity which it inculcates will make the contrary idea *so exceedingly unreasonable*. Still, its principal influence will concern our notions about the *nature* of the future life. It is on this point mainly that the following pages will simply offer some suggestions. Or, to once more state it more particularly: Socialism will remove the obstacles in the way of a hearty acceptance of a rational belief in a future life.

45. Before entering upon this subject, I wish in this section to make a digression, which, however foreign to Socialism it seems, may yet turn out to be pertinent. I have already made known my firm conviction that American Socialism will inaugurate a very great religious awakening. One reason I have mentioned is, that the delights of this life will make all men indisposed to believe in annihilation of consciousness; but there is another of far greater force—that the working masses will then, for the first time, become an active religious factor. They are now, practically, all sceptics, or rather indifferent, and no wonder, for they necessarily become rather weary of life, and have no leisure at all for so much as thinking over religious matters. But when Socialism gives them leisure and zest for life, it will be vastly different. They are naturally religious at bottom, and religious studies and speculations are naturally congenial to them. They will, I am sure, commence these studies with ardour, and, in their enthusiasm, carry their fellow-citizens along with them. Now, it so happens that certain investigations have started lately that will powerfully appeal, and be peculiarly suitable to the minds of working men.

It is quite remarkable that when scepticism was greatest, a movement in the contrary direction was inaugurated, taking the shapes of great interest in Buddhism, and the investigation of Psychic Societies into the hidden forces of the soul. Dismissing Buddhism by remarking that it, by its new ideas of *Karma* and *Pre-existence*, may do much to widen men's horizon—it was of the

latter doctrine that Hume said that "It is the only kind of immortality that Philosophy can hearken to"—I should say that the investigation of the Psychic or Dialectical Society of London, as reported by Sergeant-at-Law Edward W. Cox in his remarkable volumes entitled *What Am I?* are decidedly those that promise to have the most practical value for the future.

This society has started from the proposition that although little can be learned from the motions of the human mechanism in its *normal* condition when the machine is working smoothly, a great deal may obviously be learned from it when observed in its *abnormal* conditions, when parts of the machinery are thrown out of gear. They concluded that forces whose presence is imperceptible when working well will be exhibited when working irregularly, and thus that we may learn their uses by their *failure*, their power by their *friction*, and from their *imperfect* or *misshapen* products what are their proper functions. And they started in to study the Soul and its manifestations under these abnormal conditions. Electricians do not perceive by *sense* the thing called magnetism or electricity. They cannot see, feel, nor hear these immaterial forces, but are, nevertheless, assured of their existence. It is by observing *the operations upon matter* of the forces that they reasonably infer their existence, and have learned, and are learning, much of their qualities and powers.

In the normal state of the mechanism the soul and the brain work together so harmoniously that it is difficult, if not impossible, to show their mutual relation. Still they commenced there—with familiar *Sleep and Dreams*. The control of the will over the brain is then suspended. The partial exercise of the brain produces dreams—the mind invents a drama thronged with impossibilities, paints scenery, marshals the actors, and places in their mouths appropriate dialogues.

This work of creative genius is executed nightly, not by the intelligent only, but by the most stupid; illiterate persons who, when awake, are poor in ideas and speech, perform the seeming wonder—miracle almost—of constructing continuous stories. Such a shrewd lawyer as Cox concludes that this alone tends to show what the soul can do when not clogged by corporeal condi-

tions, but released from the obligations of adapting itself to the capacities of the body.

Somnambulism they found is another undisputed abnormal condition, which is both natural and can be produced artificially, and which, to the mind of Cox, tends to prove that the soul can exist distinct from the body. In that condition both Consciousness and Will are suspended, and the Soul ceases to communicate through the body with the external world. The Soul—or the Patient—acts independently; it perceives directly, without the aid of the senses, objects which in the normal condition of the organism are perceptible only through the senses; sees without sight, hears without ears, feels without the sense of touch.

Trance, again, is a condition where the intelligent “Something”—the Soul—is still further dislocated in its connection with the body. The soul *acts* its dream, but has no memory of it in its waking state; it has in trance a perfect conscious life of its own and even a separate memory. The will is often awake and can control the body, but receives no intelligence through the body. This condition of Trance has raised in Cox’s mind a strong probability of immortality by proving that even in this life Soul and Body can be partially severed and preserve distinct existences.

But the most instructive and suggestive of all the investigations of this Dialectical Society have related to what they call *Psychism*. If Spiritualism¹ has not done any other good, it has at least led to most remarkable discoveries in regard to the soul, for “Psychism” is really the scientific name for it. Psychic Force is soul-force; that it exists is just as sure as that the force exists by means of which the magnet moves the steel without contact, though we are ignorant of the imperceptible “something” that passes from the magnet to the steel. This “force” the Soul in the normal state uses evenly upon the entire organism through the nerves, but when a disturbance occurs, it produces phenomena that startle us by their strangeness and inconsistency with its *customary* course. This, surely, is a most suggestive scientific discovery, that such a condition as “Psychism” does in fact exist,

¹ What a pity that the believers in ghosts have been permitted to appropriate to themselves this splendid word!

in which the Soul can direct its force immediately on the material world, without as normally using the agency of the brain and body. It seems to me that O. B. Frothingham's opinion in an article in the *Atlantic Monthly* for August, 1890, is perfectly sound: that the results of the investigations, so far, "furnish a firm foundation for personal continuity and a basis for faith to build upon."

I simply suggest that these and similar investigations may powerfully affect the common mind when decent material conditions once exist.

46. I insist that Socialism will have a *decisive* influence on men's views of a future life. Let me again and again emphasise "men's views." I do not of course pretend for a moment that Socialism will enable us to get so much as a peep beyond the gates of death, but next to positive knowledge on this subject come moral convictions, and perhaps the latter is for all practical purposes, both for happiness in this world, and still more to give colour to life and motive to action, by far the most important. Now I have not the least doubt that Socialism will, especially in connection with the new ideas I have mentioned, make men pretty unanimous as to the *fact* of a future life, but even on that I lay no stress. What I deem by far most important is that I am confident that men under a socialist *régime* will fancy themselves a far different *kind* of future life from what they do now—both those who now believe and those who disbelieve in it. By dwelling myself in imagination very much on the conditions under Socialism, I believe I have perceived what men in future will embrace and what they will discard; I believe that the state of the future life, which they thus will instinctively prefer, will be what their reason will sanction, and experiences I myself have passed through have tested for me the practical value of these ideas. I think the fact of this future *belief* can be proved pretty logically, and I commence as a preliminary by showing that Memory is a very distinct thing from Self-consciousness.

In this respect we ought to look at facts of absolutely scientific certainty which are of vast import. I refer to the numerous

medical cases on record where various diseases have had the effect of *blotting out every vestige of memory* up to the date of the disease. This loss of memory is called "amnesia," and I take the following facts from the well-known French psychologist, M. Th. Ribot.

Temporary amnesia usually makes its appearance suddenly, and ends in the same way. It may vary from a few minutes to several years. An educated man, thirty-one years of age, found himself one day at his desk in a confused condition; he remembered having ordered his dinner, but everything else was a blank. He returned to his dining-place and was told, in answer to his questions, that he had both eaten his dinner and paid for it. A young woman who was married to a man she loved passionately was seized during confinement with prolonged syncope, at the end of which she lost all recollection of events occurring since her marriage, inclusive of the ceremony itself, but she remembered clearly the rest of her life up to that point. She had, up to the publication of the fact, never recovered her recollection of this period, but believed her parents when they told her that she was a wife and mother of a son, but never became convinced. There are many cases where memory is altogether lost—total amnesia. The writers in describing these cases, compare the patient to an infant and call his mind *a tabula rasa*.

Here is another suggestive case: A young American woman who had a copious stock of ideas fell one day into a profound sleep, and on waking was discovered to have lost every trace of acquired knowledge. It was found necessary to teach her everything over again. With considerable proficiency she soon became once more acquainted with persons and objects, like a child for the first time introduced into the world. Then another fit of somnolency came over her, and on being aroused from that, it was found that she was restored to the state in which she was before the first paroxysm, but now wholly ignorant of every event and occurrence that afterward had happened to her. In the one state she possessed fine powers of penmanship, while in the other she wrote a poor, awkward hand, having not had time to become an expert. These states alternated for four years. Ribot calls this mis-

takenly, as I should say, a "double consciousness;" evidently it should rather be called a "double memory."

Simple drunkenness is sometimes marked by loss of one memory and the return of another particular memory, of which there is an instance, well-known to the medical profession, of an Irish porter who, having lost a package while drunk, got drunk again and then remembered where he had left it.

I think these cases tend to show the point that I wish to establish, that memory is no part of our inmost being; that it is, contrary to the received opinion, an accretion on our "self." These different patients had precisely *not*, as Ribot say, a "double consciousness;" on the contrary, they remained the same old "selves" they were before, the same "I's," egos, *retained their identity*, in other words. The change was, simply, a new, another memory.

It is really the same thing we experience ourselves, everyone of us, in the course of our lives, though not in this startling manner. The memory of our past life, first of our childhood, and then of our youth, and so on progressively, is forever vanishing, so that the greater part of our life is, with us all, a great blank. The old memory is constantly disappearing and a new one constantly forming.

Yet, we know that throughout this change of Memory we are the same "I," we retain our identity from childhood to old age. Suppose, instead of a progressive change of memory, a sponge were applied to the memory and its contents entirely wiped out—that is what is, as a matter of fact, done in the above recorded cases. What is the effect? That we forget all we have learned, our whole previous experience is a blank; we forget our acquaintances, but that, by no means, involves the destruction of our identity. We remain the same ego, and *are conscious of ourselves*, as such; our "self" remains, with all its faculties. Indeed, most of us experience this condition once in every twenty-four hours. Make the experience for yourself. On waking in the morning, you most likely will for some moments, of longer and shorter duration, not be able to recollect where you are or whether your position is one of happiness or misery, but you know perfectly well you are yourself.

Now what has this to do with—not, please observe, with a future life, but with—*our ideas about a future life?*

47. There are two ways in which I firmly believe American Socialism will radically modify our views about the Hereafter: one, which presents no difficulty, and is to my mind certain and of far-reaching, practical importance, will be treated of in the forty-ninth section; but the other I approach frankly, with trepidation though I am, fortunately, fortified by the support of recognised philosophers. It will be discussed in this section in its negative aspect, and in the following from its positive side.

When we now think of another life, whether believers or unbelievers, we always think of it as a continuation, or *second volume*, so to say, of this. We suppose that we pass over into that other life precisely as we leave this. If we pass away as a beggar, we enter the other life *with the memory* of a beggar; if as an emperor, *with the memory of an emperor*. Mallock has expressed this by saying that our hope of immortality consists in expecting to finish the picture we have commenced in this. Now, I say, that contrariwise Socialism will dispose us to believe that we shall enter upon the other life with our *personality* alone.

It will here be requisite to explain the distinction I make between individuality and personality, and to recall that I, in Chapter III., stated that we here would need the *datum* of our “private” and “social self.” The distinction, I know, will be one unusual in English and opposed to the etymology of one of the words, but that will hardly be an objection, if I make a proper definition, the more so as I have the authority of French philosophers in favour of my usage of the word.

“Personality” is derived from *persona*; this Latin word meant “mask”¹ or the “character” personated by the actor (as for instance when Cicero says: “*Ego sustineo tres personas*”—I am sustaining three characters). I shall use Individuality in this sense and Personality in precisely the opposite sense. By *individuality*, then, I mean all the qualities that distinguish me from other men, corresponding to my personal, private “self”—

¹From *per-square*, sound through, i.e. the voice.

we may call it *Self-ness*, this it is which enables me to perform my special functions and be useful in my sphere. *Personality*, on the other hand, is my innermost being, my "social self," what I have in common with other men—this we may call *Self-hood*, and this it is which entitles me to the divine regard. This is also the distinction which Paul Janet makes in his work *La Morale*:¹ "Individuality is composed of all the exterior circumstances that distinguish one man from another. The individual has such a body, such a face, is of such an age, lives in a given country at a given period; he has had such and such functions, and has performed such and such actions. But Personality strikes its roots into Individuality, yet constantly tends to disengage them. I am a person, not as I am capable of sensation, but in so far as I think, love and will."

At present we cannot so much as conceive of a future life without carrying our peculiarities, our differences over into it. That is, then, the point upon which this whole argument turns: that those who now believe in immortality imagine it to correspond to this life in all particulars, with all its pretensions, as your own features answer to the face in your mirror, and what is still more important, the multitudes who do not believe in it do so precisely for the reason that they have the same ideas of immortality, and such future life seems irrational to them, preposterous, in fact; their common-sense forbids them to believe it.

In the last half of their conclusion they are undoubtedly right; such a future life is irrational, and then there is the further difficulty that memory seems to be reared on the bodily basis, and that therefore it seems that it will be dissolved with the dissolution of the body. But no one but the choicest spirits can so much as conceive of immortality without memory. Here it is Socialism will transform men's understanding: it will make them not merely see, but heartily admit, *that what is vouched for, preserved by, memory is husks, not worth immortality*. It seems to me inevitable that Socialism will, in the course of a not very long period, have that effect; that the consequence from it will be deep and

¹ Translated into English under the supervision of Noah Porter of Yale College.

far-reaching ; that it will be a religious achievement only second in importance to the conviction of God's presence, but both equally sure of being foretold.

The late Hon. George F. Talbot wrote an essay on Immortality, published in *The New Ideal*, January, 1890. The following extracts give the leading idea in it :

"I am told, and men generally believe, that, after death, the essence of every man—all of him that is not material and earthly—lives on with the same faculties of mind and the same traits of character he had possessed as a mortal. I do not believe this. I do not deny that my animal instinct shrinks from the loss of personal identity with genuine apprehension. I sometimes surmise that God, who knows better than I what is best, will disregard that brute cry of the animal instinct, and work out his better purpose. Why should the alternative of personal immortality be blank nothingness and death? I believe in the immortality of the *soul* rather than in the immortality of *souls*. The permanent is the infinite, and whatever is finite, whatever exists in the condition of individuality, is necessarily transient."

The last sentence is very true : "Whatever exists in the condition of *individuality* is necessarily transient ;" that is precisely what I have just affirmed. But Talbot thought that this necessarily destroyed identity, simply because he did not make any distinction between "individuality" and "personality." Remember that Memory is not at all necessary to our identity ; all, then, that is necessary to reconcile us to a future life without it and even heartily prefer it, is precisely what Socialism will give us : *Disdain and unconcern for what memory preserves*, to wit : our self-ness, in contradistinction to our self-hood—the mass of our experiences, personal peculiarities, which now are so dear to us, but which might have been very different, indeed, and yet our "I" have remained the same.

They will further come to acknowledge that a future life where we remembered our earthly experiences and sufferings, remembered that we had been beggars and princes here would be simply intolerable. It would be carrying Pharisaism to extremes that would be harrowing to the worst of Pharisees ;—as Mme. de Stael

is said to have asked a German Prince: "Would you want to be born a prince in the next life?" What terrible old bores and fogies we all should be, especially those of us who have been heroes and geniuses here! How would Browning get along with Fitzgerald in whose face he was ready to spit? Is an earthly king there to regret his life here, or have his old courtiers and subjects about him? Mahomet would then be the most conceited fellow imaginable! No wonder that such an inane idea disgusts thoughtful people, and makes them reject belief in immortality.

And our great religious founders never contemplated a future life as merely a sort of second volume of our earthly history. Christianity itself—does it not teach that with this weight of clay our painful and weary earthly consciousness shall drop off, that we shall forget our past and sad experiences? It seems to me, further, that the modern tendency to Buddhism is significant as predisposing us to this change of views.

48. In its positive form, then, the theory is that a socialist régime will dispose men to look on immortality as immortality of the *highest* in us; this will make another intimate connection between morality and religion, and let us see how imperfect the former is without the latter. Let us recall that Morality is self-realisation: realisation of the true, the real self, which we saw in the fourth chapter was the *social* self—self as a member of society, of Humanity, in contradistinction to the private self. Now, the mischief of the present Social Order is, that this private self is, even with "moral" men, virtually the exclusive self, because we are *made*, COMPELLED, by the prevailing system to look out for our private interests first of all, but Socialism will so repress this private self that men will refuse any longer to identify themselves with it; they will so live in the lives of others, will find humanity so involved in their own very essence that their social self will be all in all to them; they will acknowledge this alone, this divine part of them, as their real personality, and concerned only about that. Immortality will to them mean continuity of their social self exclusively; they simply will not care for any other immortality—thus religion becomes truly the fruit of morals.

Now mark, that this social self is what is affirmed by Self-Consciousness, while Memory avouches our private self. Socialism will, of course, not dogmatise at all about the matter; it will say nothing about whether a memory of our earthly experience will or will not follow us into the future life. But since, undoubtedly, the persistence of memory creates insuperable difficulties to a belief in immortality, a socialist *régime* will vastly strengthen the belief by inclining men, not simply to dispense with memory, but to heartily embrace the theory of its absence.

Let us consider how this belief may be conceived, formulated practically. Mankind will then believe that humanity, past, present and future, is one vast *organic* whole, of which not a single constituent element, a single "social self," *ego*, could disappear without bringing the cosmos into confusion; they will believe that *somewhere* (why not, as a matter of speculation, on another planet, as Plato supposed?) the advance guard of humanity, having prepared the way for us here on earth, are at work once more and pursuing its and our destiny; that *death is a sponge, wiping out memory but not our identity*, and that after it we shall find ourselves awakening into conscious being by another birth, as indeed we are now awakening every morning, with humanity all around us there as here, but all on a higher plane than in this earth life which witnessed our issue from animality, and nearer to God; they will believe that they shall not there personally recognise their beloved ones on earth, but this will be to them, unlike what it is to men now, a matter of comparative indifference, since they will know that these friends and dear ones *are there* around them somewhere; they will finally believe that they there will be perfectly self-conscious, possess their complete self-hood, with all their attainments acquired here (the *Karma* of Buddhists) but purified.

It must be repeated that memory is *not* necessary to the unique feeling of Self-consciousness. It is equally indescribable, equally beyond analysis or explanation why in this life I know I am myself—in the morning before memory returns.

Now, considering this suggestion in the earnest, unprejudiced religious spirit proper to it—while it may in our time look strange as it certainly is novel—I cannot get over the conviction that,

granting my premises, granting that a socialist régime is surely what is coming, if it really will have the consequences, set forth in detail in the previous pages, if it really will develop morality as supposed, I am not logical and correct in my argument, that it will develop such a belief in God and Immortality. To me the argument appears without a flaw, and, as it seems, ought to persuade all religious minds to further Socialism with all the strength and influence they possess.

I am perfectly well aware that I have in this and the preceding section been treading on delicate ground, but fortunately I found out some time ago that I was mistaken in the notion I for years had that the thoughts here set forth were original with myself. Fortunately they are not. No man of intellect, however practical his nature, can help indulging in dreams on that subject, and acknowledged philosophers have come to definite conclusions identical with my own. Of these I shall here refer only to the Frenchman from whom I have already quoted—Paul Janet and his *La Morale*.

We remember how he stated the distinction between individuality and personality; but he goes further: "Does this individual want to be immortal? But how will you recognise Cæsar without his body, his aspect and his vices? No, what is immortal is not such fragile or illusory accidentals, which one in his vanity might wish to carry over. Personality is the consciousness of the impersonal (his italics). I am a person, not as I am capable of sensation, of physical pleasure and pain, but in so far as I think, love and will. This consciousness which every man has of the divine within him, is immortal, it is personality; and Eternal Life is the consummation (not annihilation) of personality. . . . Even in this life experience tells us that the life of personality does not involve loss of consciousness. The savant forgets himself in the great truth he has discovered; he knows no longer when or where he exists, but he has consciousness of this. The artist loses himself in the masterpieces he has created, but he enjoys all this. The lover loses himself in the beloved, but he is conscious of his absorption."

Ah, it is difficult to describe the gratification, the joy that over-

came me in this discovery that another mind concurred with my own in the same definite thought!

Professor Graham presents the same thought, not however as a definite conclusion, but simply as an hypothesis worthy of attention. He speaks in his *Creed of Science* to objectors, as follows:

"But it would not be really *you*, Common Sense exclaims, without memory to make the link of connection between your supposed 'self' and your present 'self.' No matter, we say, that other self will be just as good as me, if the same feeling of self-consciousness gathers around it then and there, as here and now. . . . Memory is necessary to connect my present with my past consciousness, but is not necessary, in order to have the peculiar feeling of self-consciousness, unshared by any other being, which is the essence of the part of 'self.'"

Is there, then, any originality in my presentation of this idea?

I should say that there is. Others treat it as a possible, at most, a probable solution, but all must admit that it is entirely unsuitable and obnoxious to minds living under an individualistic order of things. But I treat it as a solution that will naturally, almost inevitably, evolve out of the social order and the moral speculations incident to a socialist *régime*, as a solution that will be congenial, perhaps alone congenial to minds disciplined by, say, fifty years of Socialism. It seems to me that such a belief will fitly crown the most spiritual form of Christianity.

Comte's Humanity, a vision in a sea of nothingness, and each individual existence bounded by the cradle and grave—what an emptiness of life! How chilling? What bubbles we then are, continually bursting! How bright, in comparison, the conception of our personality, meandering like an underground river through the hidden world of God's creation, and enabling us, at each stage, to partake of Humanity's victories.

True, here we touch the primal source of the desire for immortality, as well as the real sting of death: the eternal *farewell*. I am well aware of it. This is the eternal cry of the human heart. Love and affection are the most divine things evolved, and hence another stage for love is demanded. True, but I insist, that here there is a confusion of two distinct ideas,

which I know will remain confused as long as Individualism lasts, except to those who already possess socialist hearts. But I also know—and by a conviction gained by a great personal bereavement—that when Socialism has once changed all human hearts, as it will, men will distinguish between capacity for love, which will go on increasing, and this craving for meeting with the *persons* of the beloved ones, which they will come to acknowledge to be a passing weakness of the flesh, as even in this life the love for lost ones in the course of time is forgotten ; and then we must not forget that, under Socialism, Universal Love will be vastly intensified, to a great extent amalgamating with private affections, whose principal office indeed it is to lead up to it.

49. Now, however, we enter from twilight into bright, clear light. *One Destiny awaits us all.* That we are *unitedly* entering upon our unknown destinies will surely be admitted by all having socialist hearts. As it is the glory of Christianity to have established the brotherhood of man by our descent from one pair, so it will be the glory of Socialism—its second great achievement on the problem of the Hereafter—to have clinched the organic unity of men by insuring us a common destiny. It is rather curious to note, that our so-called “Determinists” deny Free-will in order to get rid of religion altogether ; Free-will advocates insist on it, in order to send the majority of men to hell ; posterity, on the other hand, will admit both Necessity and Free-will with the result of insuring all men the same future.

It is often said that it would be impossible to found a new religion, because it would be futile to imagine a higher morality than our churches teach. It is seen by all that the loftiest Morality will necessarily be victorious. Well, none will surely deny, that a common redemption is the very highest and noblest morality. x this is not the reason.

Protestantism was, of course, a needful religious movement, but surely it has proved no unmixed good. During the Middle Ages each in due proportion participated in the divine blessing upon earth and looked forward to an identical glory, while everyone could, by using the same formula, ready at hand, obtain the great

prize. But the Calvinism of Baxter and Edwards committed, unwittingly of course, an awful crime both against God and man, by dividing mankind from all eternity into two hostile camps, each going their separate ways. What a terrible selfish, anti-social doctrine, the mother of our Individualism and Pharisaism, and of the sneaking private designs on God's bounty, in the shape of personal salvation for oneself, no matter what becomes of the race or even of wife or husband !

It really strikes me as another sign of divine Providence that Protestantism has been divided into innumerable sects, for conceive, if you can, the depth into which Pharisaism would have sunk if one sect had had sole monopoly of religion in Protestant countries as Catholicism has had in its domain. It is one of the signs of the times that the doctrine of hell is being silently dropped by all; that we more and more do our duty, not from religious fears, but from what is due to men as our fellow-men. This, at all events, is one good result of our scepticism. The doctrine of hell, when in vigour, was the greatest obstacle to brotherhood and fellowship among men. What a miserable idea of the future life it was which the poor and lowly had in former times ! that it was a state where the conditions here were reversed : there they would be on top and the rich beneath ! We see now, that the thought of even one man in hell would fill heaven with misery and be enough to destroy all rational ideas of immortality.

Here, I know, we meet with the stumbling-block, that many, perhaps the majority of men, actually grudge scoundrels and criminals—such a fellow, for instance, as the Boston brother-murderer—the privilege, even after an immensity of sufferings, to share their own destiny. Selfishness, indeed, seems so ingrained in our countrymen, that they actually have no word, positively expressing “not to grudge” a word, corresponding to the German “zu gönnen.” That is very significant, it seems to me. It is in this respect that we ought to feel humbly grateful to Victor Hugo for presenting us a brave, humane object-lesson in his galley-slave Valjean. This man is surely as dangerous a criminal as ever was. What healthy, moral man would not like to strangle him after he has robbed the poor Savoyard boy ? But when we met him

again as Mairé Madeleine, what sympathetic man is not ready to bless Hugo for showing us what nobility may be hidden inside a hideously repulsive shell?

Ah, I am sure Hugo had a far deeper insight into the divine character than the orthodox Christians who denied him fellowship. He knew that God is Love, Love of the intensest and most comprehensive kind; in that respect he is much superior to Browning, who did not doubt God's omnipotence, but did doubt His love. Why, Love must be God's very nature, and *an absolute need* that makes Him descend to our ugliest weaknesses, and which will make Him not rest till the lowest man is raised to the level of the good. It is to this loftiest conception of God we must come in time; and Socialism will enable us to attain to it.

But talk now to one of our pious men of what he conceives to be the highest themes, and you will learn to your astonishment that in his opinion God takes no interest in universal questions, in those economical, political, and social questions which interest all good and wise men in proportion to their goodness and wisdom, but only in some trifling private question about the "salvation" of this, that, or the other individual soul. Yet what can more revolt a mind who conceives of God as a being of infinite love than the thought of enjoying a blessing at His hands which all other men cannot equally share? But nearly all our religious fellow-men are, as has been well said, "self-complacent Pharisees to whom nothing comes acceptably which does not come of merit. We hold that we are properly separated before God into virtuous and vicious beings. Our religious habits have so little spiritual innocence, and so inflamed us with mercenary intentions towards God, that we are filled with every sneaking, private, personal design upon His bounty." It is so with both Protestants and Catholics. As to the former, I need only refer to Bunyan's hero, Christian, who has been a model to all Evangelicals, and who yet leaves his wife and family behind in the City of Destruction. As to the latter, think simply of Cardinal Newman's famous "Myself and God" as the only beings he was concerned about!—aye, reflect simply on the first question and answer of the Roman Catholic Catechism: "Why did God make you? To know Him, to love

Him, and to serve Him in this world and to be happy with Him in the next;" which answer I pronounce a wicked, immoral teaching, for the simple reason that it is a *half-truth*—omitting the other half, love of our neighbour—precisely analogous to the way the devil is said to read the ten commandments: by covering each "not" with his finger.

Ideas of God and Immortality are the crown of Morals, but the latter would subsist to all eternity, though all religions were swept into oblivion. Spencer's task is, therefore, lost labour: there is no need of "a new regulative system to replace supernatural systems." That, however, does not prevent religion from having a vast reflex-influence on morals; it links the latter with the Eternal in whose Divine repose, as Plato taught, it is contained. It is surprising to see able men putting these problems aside with a smile as being unimportant, as mere metaphysical puzzles of an insoluble kind which we may cease to think about without producing any particular effect on Morality. Yet, the truth is, that Morality depends on what men are, whether Humanity is precious or contemptible; depends on whether this life is a stage in something larger and wider or not.

What unity and vigour, how distinct and original a tone will the conviction of God's vital presence in Humanity give to life! To be, each of us, an integral part of the body of the living God, what a race-consciousness that will produce!

And that other conviction, that we are all mysteriously permanent beings destined for the same holiness, what pettiness it will confer on our private self, and what a sacredness on our higher nature, and on all human beings! Would it be possible in a country with such a belief that a Sidgwick could, in regard to the proposition to set apart certain unfortunate women from society, write these infamous words once before quoted in this essay: "This view has perhaps a superficial plausibility, for continence involves a *considerable loss of pleasure*."

Men *must* have some theory to give colour and vigour to their actions. The prevailing tolerance—really indifference—now a necessary evil, will soon become intolerable. Socialism makes this world a real one, but preparatory to another; makes selfish-

ness satanic, Individualism a delusion, and will teach us that while unlikeness is a necessary condition for individuality, *i.e.*, for being useful in this world, it is our common humanity, as said, that entitles us to the Divine regard.

I have finished this study in ethics. An inward force has seemed to urge me on and leave me no peace till I had finished it, down even in the abyss, shut out from those sympathies and friendships I so much prize, but with the conviction that I really had a message to deliver. The explanation is very simple: Socialism, with whose spirit I surely have familiarised myself, if any one has, is the bearer to us of a revelation of God's will and of Man's Destiny. Hence I can declare to those who, in toying with these pages, perhaps may glance at these closing lines, that this essay, in spite of its uncouth form, does contain solemn truths and important lessons, both timely and novel, and which will soon have to be learned by us all.

To estimate these truths let me make a comparison. Six years ago I published *The Co-operative Commonwealth*. I cannot complain of its success in this country and England; later phenomena certainly prove that it has scattered many germs, and that not a few have taken root. But my point is, that its ideas, like those of the books of Henry George and Edward Bellamy, moved mainly in the plane of material interests. I more and more have become convinced that Karl Marx's doctrine, that the bread-and-butter question is the motive force of progress, is not tenable, but that we must grasp the very highest moral and religious truths.

In a nutshell they are these: Our churches teach, as Browning teaches, that each individual person is, in himself, all-in-all, and that his eternal progress can be accomplished by himself. This is false; *it is false!* But equally false is the Positivist position that the race, by itself, is the precious element, and that it is our individual duty to work for posterity, a thousand years hence, though to us personally it can mean nothing at all. Socialism reveals God's truth: that the individual person in the race is what is important; that each person is an eternal, integral part of Humanity, that the fibres of each "self" are, and will eternally remain, inter

twined with those of posterity and of our ancestors. From this follows this other truth, that our present great evil is not our abnormal wealth and abnormal poverty, so much as that men are used as *means* to others' *private ends*. And the conclusion is, that the Brotherhood of Man is the supreme interest of each one of us; that it is Morality, it is our Destiny, and also the prescribed road to our Destiny. This is the only conclusion that can accomplish the tremendous feat of making the whole Humanity, with all its scoundrels and innumerable disagreeable people, dear to each of us—a duty which God imperatively lays upon us. But it is a tremendous feat: those who overflow with love for mankind generally know so little of it, and are so inefficient.

Socialism, I am confident, will be found the key to the riddle of life—the riddle of the Sphinx.

50. And now the most solemn moment has arrived for me. When I reflect that what remains to be said may prove the spark that, applied to the will of some of my readers, may turn them into the Leaders of Men whom we so much need, I almost tremble from the excitement that masters me. How blessed life then would be! For everything else is ready—only leaders are wanting.

What sort of a man is needed for that purpose? First, you must believe that you have a life work to do, beside the labour by which you gain your living, and that it is by far the most important, and resolve to devote all the leisure you can get to it. The man who says, "Oh, it is very important indeed, but I have but little time for it," is not wanted at all. Phillips Brooks said lately, very truly and very eloquently, to the Harvard seniors: "Now the one great thing we need is to believe that in character and *service* lies the true life of a human creature. We do not thoroughly believe that. We think of the struggle to be perfect, and the effort to serve humanity as suburbs of human life, great districts into which excursions are to be made, heavens into which ecstatic flights are to be soared, not as the very city and citadel of humanity, to live outside of which is not to be a man."

Next, you must consider this life-work not a mere hobby, but

look upon yourself as God's co-worker. The more I reflect, the more I become convinced that the leaders must come out from among our profoundly religious minds. Only they can get up the needed enthusiasm—and the coming generation will perhaps rival that of the crusades in enthusiasm—and bring about the Great Change in love, and not in hate. You must feel within yourself that God needs you, that He cannot do without you. Robert Browning is wrong in claiming that we are here "for the purpose of probation;" we are here to execute God's will. This is to come back to that dangerous practical heresy I referred to in the preceding chapter of that poetic volume, *God in His World*, that men are mere spectators of God's activity. It is not so!—this cannot be repeated too often. Such a sentence as "least of all do we attempt the solution of any problem," shows that the author is a "quietist," however much he repudiates it. God, indeed, plans our future, but He always reveals His plan in time to those who are to execute it. He does not directly act on the affairs of the world. We must act out our own destiny, or nothing will be done—that is the meaning of being God's co-workers, and of Free-will. Oh, if it were written in letters of fire on every heart: *We carry out God's thoughts!*

Lastly, God clearly has put a stamp on his co-workers. I mean to say there are two temperaments among us—those of an individualistic, and those of a socialistic temperament—the latter constantly growing in numbers, and they are the ones that are now needed. You must be of the latter group. Even such a splendid intellect and warm heart as Henry George is sterile soil, because he is an individualist from the crown of his head to the sole of his foot.

In order to succeed, these three things are absolutely required: stalwart, right Convictions, Energy and Organisation. Right Convictions are the *sine qua non*, and our philanthropic people do not have them at all. How many splendid men and women there are in our large cities who war against the devil, ignorance, vice, intemperance and crime. They go daily among the poor, instruct them and relieve misery wherever they can. If these should sometimes be discouraged, it would be no wonder, since theirs is

truly a Sisyphus labour: for every miserable case relieved, a fresh victim or two are thrown into the social abyss. No, there is a better way to go to work. God Himself points the way by every sign at His disposal. Ah, if a few of these persons in every large city would perceive the pointed finger! Here in Boston a few noble clergymen of different denominations have come together and are preaching by speech and writing. If but our warm-hearted people would hear their voices! If they would bring some of their friends together, energetic, intelligent persons, and commence to study these great social problems, and then come to the correct conclusion, that is, that Socialism is the coming radical Divine Social Order. The advice of the *Christian Union*: "Christian ministers should study Socialism, not in order to identify themselves with it in name, but to sit in judgment upon it," is not fit for earnest minds who want to do God's will, as little as the practice of that other minister who invites young men to come weekly to his house for discussion, but "makes no attempt to foist any theory upon the young men, nor argues specially for any economic scheme." They should improve even on the Christian Socialists who want to draw people, in the first place, into the Church, and work for Socialism only secondarily. Socialism—and the greatest service "Nationalism" has done is that it has made our people indulgent to that word—Socialism should be their first and exclusive object.

Again, I want these men to say loudly and determinedly: "We want Socialism inaugurated *in our life-time*, surely." There is not a town, I am confident, in any of our Northern states, where not three young men can be found of the right stamp. Let them seek out each other, form a brotherhood—it is with such a grand aim in common that *friends* are made—and grasp the hands of similar brotherhoods in surrounding towns, and within a year we may have a great American Brotherhood, resolved that the United States shall in twenty-one years be a Socialist Commonwealth.

It is only Energy that is needed I am confident that there are now enough young men in the land of the right kind to effect the desired change. A new wave of thought—and that socialist thought—is evidently approaching, as the philosophy of Spencer

and his class that rose with such startling rapidity to ascendancy is evidently declining.

The last requisite is *Organisation*.

One warning is absolutely needful for these men and their associates, that is : beware of becoming all officers and having no privates. An army of mere generals is worthless. These men I speak of and their friends should in time become the natural leaders, but of whom ? Ah, the privates are ready at hand : that is one of the great signs of the times.

We have already seen that our wage-earners, our labour-organisations, have for years been filled with the true socialist spirit ; without recognising God's finger, they nevertheless have seen His sign before all others. They have several times attempted to form political parties, tried to influence legislation, but without success, simply for want of competent leaders. Once they thought they had such a leader in Henry George ; we all know how splendidly they seconded him ; but they soon discovered that he did not really sympathise with them. I repeat : what they need is leaders, not—decidedly not—a programme or principles. These they have already, nobody is competent to elaborate a better programme for them.

The great danger of the associations which I should delight to see formed, is that they keep aloof from the working-men ; that they simply gather together men of their own class and become a clique of unpractical *doctrinaires*—a mutual admiration society. They must sympathise with the wage-earners, that means, sympathise with the aims and aspirations of the working-classes, but beware to patronise them ; the moment the wage-workers repudiate them, they had better dissolve. They must learn that our whole civilisation has been a struggle about the condition of the producers. This is then the practical policy for them to pursue : with untiring zeal and on all occasions to be a mouthpiece for the wage-workers in the cities and of the farmers in the country, and to *organise the sympathy* which already exists for them in the other classes. We have seen just as these pages are being finished, a sad—as it seems to me—and glaring evidence of the need of precisely such an organisation. As is well-known,

the Federation of Labour had resolved on last May 1st to force, by strikes, a normal working day of eight hours. All clear-seeing reformers know this is the necessary first step, and every one else—even our politicians—knows and admits that the measure is just and must soon obtain. Now, instead of calling out the whole body of Organised Labour in all the cities, the opportunity was frittered away by limiting the movement to the carpenters, as a feeler. Perhaps it was the best to be done—under the circumstances, but these circumstances should no longer have existed. A brotherhood such as I plead for, giving them energetic, moral support, would have made the eight-hour day a fact to-day.

There are very many socialistic measures ripe and waiting now for such a brotherhood: nationalisation of the telegraph system with a true civil service *for it*; municipal control of the innumerable public conveniences and, necessities; advances by government to our farmers, and more than anything else, the thorough education of our children—which, however, the more it is improved, will show the more, that education is absolutely futile without a socialistic order of things. Ah, such a brotherhood will be divine. What friendships it will give rise to! What influence for good it will possess! What love for good and noble manhood it will breed!

THE END.